DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 337 917 EA 023 452

AUTHOR	Su, Zhixin
TITLE	School-University Partnerships: Ideas and Experiments (1986-1990). Occasional Paper No. 12.
INSTITUTION	Washington Univ., Seattle. Center for Educational Renewal.
PUB DATE	Jul 91
NOTE	119p.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Role; *College School Cooperation; *Cooperative Programs; *Educational Cooperation; *Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Program Effectiveness; School Restructuring; Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Partnerships in Education

ABSTRACT

An overview of recent literature and some new models formulated by the Comprehensive Teacher Education Institutes and others regarding the development of school-university partnerships is provided in this paper. Following a general introduction, a brief account of the origins, development, and definitions of school-university partnerships is provided in section 2, and different orientations and approaches currently in use are discussed in section 3. The fourth section describes "commonplaces" shared by partnerships and addresses four areas of concern: purpose, structure, substance, and evaluation. The fifth section describes several school-university experiments, and section 6 identifies stages of development, program characteristics for success, and effects of the juxtaposition of the school and university cultures. A conclusion is that the paradigm of symbiotic mutualism and simultaneous renewal offers the most promise for effective reform. Although the development of a partnership culture is complicated, the rapid evolution of school-university partnerships in recent years demonstrates that schools and universities can work together cooperatively. (97 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED337917

Center for Educational Renewal

SCHOOL-UNIVERSITY PARTNERSHIPS: IDEAS AND EXPERIMENTS (1986-1990)

Zhixin Su
Occasional Paper No. 12
July 1990

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

OCCASIONAL PAPER SERIES

**Institute for the Study of Educational Policy
College of Education
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195**

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J I Goodlad

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 023452

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The urge to form partnerships, to link up in collaborative arrangements, is perhaps the oldest, strongest, and most fundamental force in nature. There are no solitary, free living creatures: every form of life is dependent on other forms. The great successes in evolution, the mutants who have so to speak, made it, have done so by fitting in with, and sustaining the rest of life. Up to now we might be counted among the brilliant successes, but flashy and perhaps unstable. We should go warily into the future, looking for ways to be more useful, listening more carefully for the signals, watching our step, and having an eye out for partners.

____Lewis Thomas, "On the Uncertainty of Science"

Table of Contents

Preface i

I. Introduction 1

II. Origins, Development, and Definitions 4

III. Orientations of School-University Partnerships . . . 21

IV. Commonplaces of School-University Partnerships . . . 37

V. Experiments of School-University Partnerships . . . 57

VI. Evolving Understandings 81

VII. Conclusion: Toward a Culture of School-University Partnerships 97

Bibliography 104

PREFACE

Since its beginnings in September 1985, the Center for Educational Renewal has devoted major attention to the cultivation and development of school-university partnerships for simultaneously renewing schools and the education of those persons who work in them. Its Occasional Paper Series has served both to promote and to serve as a kind of intellectual conscience for the Center's chief endeavor in this field--namely, the creation and continued encouragement of the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER). The NNER was announced in April, 1986, as comprising ten school-university partnerships. Today, there are thirteen in as many states.

Occasional Paper No. 1, written in 1986 and revised in 1987, put forward a clutch of concepts regarding what I referred to as symbiotic partnerships involving the close joining of two quite different cultures--schools and universities--for purposes of strengthening both. Such partnerships would be worth the effort, I reasoned, only if the marriage partners saw, valued, and worked toward the satisfaction of self-interests mutually held. In Occasional Paper No. 2, Richard W. Clark reported his review of the relevant literature and the results of conversations with individuals perceived to be involved in partnerships resembling the definition presented in Occasional Paper No. 1.

His net yielded little. Clark found a number of loosely coupled associations between schools and universities but no marriages of equal partners. One tightly coupled relationship joined several faculty members of a university with the total faculty of one school in a long-term mutual endeavor. One long-term consortium of school districts and a major university had spawned in recent years a number of projects in which university and school personnel were closely joined. But all fell short of the level of commitment and mutuality called for in the definition of symbiotic partnerships and the criteria put forward for membership in the NNER. Clark identified "commitment" as the common missing ingredient.

In Occasional Paper No. 12, Zhixin Su visits the recent literature and the current scene, circa late spring 1990, regarding the development of school-university partnerships. The rapid growth in papers and reports since Clark's 1985-86 review suggests at first blush that school-university partnerships is an idea whose time is come. A second, deeper look suggests, however, that the road to productive long-term partnerships in which the two sets of institutions address each other's needs and problems is cluttered with obstacles and frustrations. Most of these are ones that my colleagues and I anticipated early on in our own work (see Kenneth A. Sirotnik and John I. Goodlad, editors, School-University Partnerships in Action, 1988).

The most anticipated finding in Su's work is that the idea of close school-university collaboration is no longer novel. Increased activity has been heralded by a spate of reporting ongoing practices at the annual conferences of major professional organizations in education. The most disappointing finding is that so much of current collaborative activity is simplistic in conception and superficial in implementation. There is a certain "we-too" syndrome in groups realizing that what they are endeavoring to do is at the top of many lists of ideas for educational improvement. The scenario most to be feared is that this notion, like many before it, will fade in popularity before its potential is realized.

There is no surprise in the fact that, in general, Su gives higher marks to the partnerships comprising the NNER than she does to most of those that are not. The questions regarding her inquiry rose, in large part, out of the criteria embedded in the mission statement guiding the NNER. And, of course, most of the school-university partnerships of the NNER have been at it for a while and have had opportunities to converse and to profit from the exchange of experiences in a network. The fact that these partnerships also come in for some criticism simply illustrates the difficulties inherent in effecting what should be but never has been a natural relationship.

Zhixin Su's report is a building-block in an even more comprehensive evaluation of school-university partnerships in concept and practice now being conducted by the Center for Educational Renewal with the financial support and encouragement of the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. My colleagues and I believe in the concept more strongly today than we did a decade ago when several of us created the first of those partnerships now constituting the NNER. And we are much more aware now than we were then of the inherent difficulties. Nonetheless, we predict that organic interconnections such as those guiding the National Network for Educational Renewal ultimately will be the norm in serious efforts to renew simultaneously schools and the education of educators.

John I. Goodlad
Professor and Director
Center for Educational Renewal
September 1990

8

School-University Partnerships: Ideas and Experiments (1986-1990)

I. Introduction

In Occasional Paper No. 3, Teacher Education Reform in the U. S. (1890-1986), I explored several chronic issues and recurring themes, one of which was the relationship between the schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) and public schools (Su 1986, 44-46). It became clear to me that before the 1980s, most SCDEs, like other branches of higher education, were largely divorced from the public schools, although one of the most frequent suggestions for reform in the 1950s was that teacher educators should get out of their ivory towers and establish direct and lasting contact with public schools and that public schools should reach out to join partnerships with teacher training institutions (see, for example, Moore 1958; and Goodlad 1958).

Clark's (1986) review of school-university relations reveals that the 1980s witnessed an increasing number of experiments on the idea of school-university collaboration and partnerships. Today educational partnerships have become the "in" thing to do in the U. S., articulated at nearly every professional conference and advocated throughout the literature (Gies and Gordon 1990). For many, the idea of school-university partnership and collaboration is now a common prescription for curing contemporary educational ills because it is part of a wider social movement to cope with the restructuring of the industrial economy and a contemporary culture of mergers, networks, coalitions, and reorganization (Pine and Keane 1989). The American Association of College for Teacher Education in its 1984 study of 499 teacher-training institutions found that about 75 percent of them were engaged in building partnerships with elementary/secondary schools to improve quality of teaching and teacher education (Su 1986). If self-reports can be believed, towards the end of the 1980s more than one thousand school-university partnerships came into being in the U. S.; further, a National School-College Partnerships Electronic Data Base was established at Syracuse University (Wilbur, Lambert, and Young 1987). According to Heaviside and Farris (1989), the participation of the nation's elementary and secondary schools in educational partnerships rose--from 42,200 (17 percent of the total schools) to 140,800 (40 percent of the total schools)--from 1983-84 to 1987-88. Among them, over half were sponsored by business; 7 percent were sponsored by colleges or universities.

Nevertheless, we cannot yet claim that the idea of school-university partnerships has taken roots in American educational practice. A closer examination reveals that among the large numbers and impressive variety of school-university partnerships flooding across the nation, too many are best characterized as faddish or jumping on the new pop education bandwagon (Gies and Gordon 1990), and some have only been symbolic, "on-paper" arrangements, or relationships based upon patronage and small monetary grants, or one-sided, noblesse oblige, service arrangements or information-sharing systems (Sirotnik and Goodlad 1988). These types of collaboration and partnerships tend to be short-term, individual-oriented or task-oriented, and focus mostly on piece-meal reform plans. They are "in" now, but soon they could be "out" (Goodlad 1988a). In examining the emerging school-university partnerships and networks in the 1980s, Clark (1986) found few instances of universities and schools or school districts collaborating as equal and long-term partners on problems representing the substantial overlapping of self-interests (Clark 1986).

In this paper, I intend to continue the review and analysis begun by Clark on school-university relationships, with an emphasis on the themes and variations in the past few years. After a brief account of the origins, development and definitions of school-university partnerships, I shall discuss the different orientations and approaches for partnerships that exist today, identify certain commonplaces in partnerships, describe a few recent experiments with different orientations, and summarize evolving understandings about the developmental stages, attributes to success and the juxtaposition of two cultures in partnerships. Finally, I shall speculate on the future of building a new culture of equitable, constructive and productive school-university partnerships, an idea that may be viable both in theory and reality.

II. Origins, Development, and Definitions

Partnerships: resurrection of an ancient idea

The urge to form partnerships and to link up in collaborative arrangements, as Thomas (1980) observes, is perhaps the oldest, strongest, and most fundamental force in nature. In fact, the idea and practice of partnership is as old as human civilization. Eisler (1987) describes a "partnership" society prior to the "dominator" societies detailed in written history. The ancient partnership society was characterized by devotion to individual actualization, with men and women playing equal, powerful roles in affiliation. The word, "gylany," was suggested by Eisler to describe these communities. Gylany represents neither matriarchy nor patriarchy, but the linkages of men and women in a purposeful society without hierarchies based on the threat of force.

In the modern western society, bureaucracy and hierarchy coupled with a culture of individualism and separation tend to reject the forming of equitable partnerships among individuals and institutions. When exploring the brief history of collaboration between colleges and schools, Gross (1988) observes that American education accurately reflects the culture of separation in the larger society.

As early as 1900, Dewey noted that the college was shut off from contact with children and youth. Its members, to a great extent away from home and forgetting their own childhood, became eventually teachers with a large amount of subject-matter at command, with little knowledge of how this was related to the minds of those to whom it was to be taught. In this division between what to teach and how to teach, each side suffered from the separation. Dewey deemed the complete interaction between "lower" and "higher" education to be essential for the creation of a democratic society but despaired that they were not in vital connection in his day.

In fact, some efforts toward school-university collaborations were initiated in the late 19th century. For example, the famous Committee of Ten recommended cooperation between school officials and universities for the purpose of improving teacher preparation and learning in all disciplines in schools (Cohen ed. 1974) and the National Education Association made vigorous attempts to affiliate public high schools with higher education (NEA 1894). However, most of such efforts yielded only "connections that did not get made" (Gaudiani and Burnett 1986). Clark (1986) provides an excellent summary of the school-university collaboration between the late 19th century and the outbreak of the World War II:

> 1. College efforts to provide for articulation with the lower schools by prescribing entrance requirements, specifying courses, and establishing entrance examinations. School officials' involvement was largely in the role of determining how they could satisfy the colleges, with several noteworthy exceptions such as the eight-year study.
>
> 2. Informal networks of university and school leaders that served to produce similarity among schools, to promote the personal power of individuals in the networks, and to establish conceptual, "scientific" approaches to school management. Often these relationships were symbiotic for the individuals involved--demonstrating that symbiotic relationships can be used for the benefit of the institutions involved or the enhancement of the individual's personal prestige. (p. 32)

In the 1950s, partly in response to the need to train more teachers but largely in reaction to Sputnik, a wave of educational collaboration hit the nation. However, in most cases, attention was paid to short-term collaborations in the revision of curriculum in science and math, but not to long-term partnerships in simultaneous and fundamental reform in both schools and universities. During the next two decades, experiments in close cooperation between colleges and schools waned as the orientation and funding shifted to other directions, although a small number of education reformers continued to keep the fire of partnerships alive in their research and practice.

The recent resurrection of school-university partnerships began as a result of the numerous studies and national reports in the 1980s that advocated closer ties between schools and other organizations (see, for example, Comer 1980; Boyer 1983; Maeroff 1983; National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983; Task Force on Education for Economic Growth 1983; National Science Board Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology 1983; Goodlad 1984; College Board 1983; Cetron 1985; and Eurich 1985). Still, even in 1985, Ernest Boyer could claim that collaborative efforts were only the exception rather than the rule:

> Today, with all the talk about educational excellence, schools and colleges still live in separate worlds. Presidents and deans rarely talk to principals and district superintendents. College faculty do not meet with their counterparts in public schools, and curriculum reforms at every level are planned in isolation. It's such a simple point--the need for close collaboration--and yet it is a priority that has been consistently ignored. Universities pretend they can have quality without working with the schools, which are, in fact, the foundation of everything universities do (Boyer 1985, p. 11)

A similar statement would perhaps not be made today (Van de Water 1989). Within the short period of the past five years, a flood of partnerships has covered the educational landscape. Participation in education partnerships by both higher institutions and lower schools has grown astronomically and more than one thousand school-university partnerships have declared existence throughout the country.

For information on the scope of the recent nationwide development of school-university partnerships, one may refer to School-College Partnerships--A Look at the Major National Models (Wilbur et al. 1988), which showcases many examples of actual school-university partnerships. Under the sponsorship of the National Association of Secondary School Principals and the American Association for Higher Education, the authors conducted a national survey of school-college partnerships. In their summary report, the authors illustrate more than a dozen different ways that schools and colleges can work together to solve problems of mutual concern for the benefit of their clientele--the school students. They also provide information for correspondence with over one thousand partnerships across the country.

Another source is Education Partnerships in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools (Heaviside and Farris 1989). In this survey report published by the National Center for Education Statistics, the authors describe partnerships between public schools and outside sponsors, including universities across the country in 1987-88 as compared with those in 1983-84. Patterns of educational partnerships are drawn according to the demographic characteristics in schools, geographic region metropolitan status, instructional level, size of school enrollment, and percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunches.

The two national survey reports mentioned above, however, do not provide adequate discussions on the core issues in the recent development of school-university partnerships. To gain an insight into the depth of the school-university partnership ideas and experiments, one needs to participate in the inquiries initiated by the following treatises:

1. School-University Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases, and Concerns (Sirotnik and Goodlad eds. 1988). In this book, the authors share their understandings of the definitions, principles, and concerns about school-university partnerships. Five case studies are presented: the Metropolitan School Study Council, the Massachusetts Coalition for School Improvement, the Southern California Partnership, the Brigham Young University Public School Partnership, and the Puget Sound Educational Consortium. The final section of the book addresses the meaning of inquiry, the shared problems and shared vision, as well as the future of school-university partnerships.

2. Collaboration for Excellence and Equity: Lessons Learned (Pine and Keane 1989). In this evaluative report of school-university partnerships, the authors argue for equal educational collaboratives where all parties concerned share energy, expertise, time, and other resources to plan and implement joint programs of preservice and inservice education, action research, curriculum development, and staff development for the purposes of achieving mutual goals for the improvement of education.

3. The Social Context of Educational Partnerships: A Semantic Review (Stoloff 1989). The author examines the changing nature of societal perspectives and the social contexts of educational partnerships or collaborations through a semantic analysis of the literature on educational cooperation and related educational themes and practices.

4. Partners in Education: How Colleges Can Work with Schools to Improve Teaching and Learning (Gross 1988). In this book, ways are described for educational partnerships to provide innovative educational and professional development programs. The author also addresses partnership programs to increase students' and teachers' motivation, and discusses strategies that ensure the long-term success of college-school partnerships.

5. Partnerships for Improving Schools (Jones and Maloy 1988). The authors try to create a framework for observing, understanding, and participating in partnerships for school improvement. After presenting illustrative cases in educational partnerships, they share their evolving understandings about the collaborative structure, activities and growth. However, since they fail to convey a clear sense of what they mean by "partnership" and "improving schools," the book can be frustrating to readers who are eager to establish their own partnerships (Soder, 1989).

6. The National Network for Educational Renewal at University of Washington has produced a steady flow of occasional papers addressing the critical and emerging issues in school-university partnerships (Goodlad 1986, 1988c; Clark 1986; Frazier 1988; and Wilson, Clark and Heckman 1989).

Educators already engaged in partnership activities or intending to build partnerships can draw useful lessons from these publications.

Partnerships: different definitions

It has become fashionable for an educational institution to belong to a partnership, be it coalition, alliance, network, consortium, or collaborative - the distinctions among them are rarely made clear (Clark 1986). There are, indeed, as many definitions as there are advocates for school-university partnerships. Sometimes they mean the same thing by different terms; other times they mean different things by the same term; most of the times, however, they mean different things by different terms although the difference may or may not be great.

Partnership

"Partnership" has been the most popular term in the literature. As a concept it has gained considerable currency in recent years (see, for example, McLaughlin 1987; Gifford 1987; Sirotnik and Goodlad 1988; Wilbur et al. 1988; Agne and Ducharme 1988; Askins and Schwiscow 1988; Gross 1988; Jones and Maloy 1988; Ruddick and Wilcox 1988; Stoloff 1989; Fowler and Martin 1989; Heaviside and Farris 1989; and U. S. Department of Education 1990). However, the concept often carries different meanings when used by different persons or institutions. For example, for the school-university partnerships in the National Network for Educational Renewal, "partnership" represents "a planned effort to establish a formal, mutually beneficial, interinstitutional relationship characterized by sufficient commitment to the effective fulfillment of overlapping functions to warrant the inevitable loss of some present control and authority on the part of the institution currently claiming dominant interest" (Goodlad 1988b, 25-26).

The more prevalent definition of partnership in the literature, however, does not emphasize a "mutually beneficial, interinstitutional relationship" or "overlapping functions" in Goodlad's definition. Instead, it usually denotes a "patronizing posture" (Gross 1988) on the part of the college or university. For example, the partnership between Boston University and the Chelsea, Mass., public schools represents a contract signed by Boston University and the Chelsea School Committee which gives the university full authority to manage the 3,600-pupil district for 10 years. The partnership is a relationship based upon the university's patronage and service arrangements for the schools, but not upon equal and mutually beneficial terms. The schools act largely as receivers of assistance and services from the university, but not as an active partner in the reform on the university campus.

Collaboration

Some scholars prefer to use the term collaboration to describe school-university partnerships. Pine and Keane (1986, 1989), for example, define collaboration as a joint endeavor of autonomous units to achieve outcomes desired by all parties but beyond the grasp of any one of the units acting alone. In their discussion, collaboration is used interchangeably with partnership. Cooper and Morey (1989), in describing the New Teacher Retention Project in San Diego area, also regard the school-university relationships as collaboration and describe it as "a powerful vehicle for understanding, which in turn contributes to shared and creative problem-solving as well as risk-taking initiatives that eventuate in mutual benefits" (p. 13).

The College Board's Educational EQuality Project Models Program prefers to use the term "collaboration" to "partnership." It defines collaboration as the voluntary coming together of dissimilar parties to work collegially on problems of mutual concern (Van de Water 1989). Here, collaboration is clearly not the same as partnership. At one of the College Board's model programs, the Yale-New Haven Teachers Institute, experience has led to the following distinction between partnership and collaboration:

> We find it increasingly useful to use partnership to describe the formal arrangement between institutions, and collaboration to characterize the collegial process of teachers working together through the Institute. Within a partnership of institutions, there is a coequal relationship of colleagues, a voluntary association of individuals, who choose to work together. Equal importance is attached to what each colleague brings to the relationship. (Vivian 1986, p. 74)

This distinction is useful because it helps clarify the confusion over terms in a simple and straightforward manner and directs attention to the more substantial issues in school-university relationships.

Some scholars, frustrated by the inadequate definitions in the recent literature on school-university relationships, have come to consider the use of the word partnership to describe the type of programs discussed as unfortunate. Poutler (1990), for example, argues that collaboration or involvement are better words than partnership, since partnership seems to imply ownership, as in a limited partnership in real estate. Rudduck and Wilcox (1988) also observe that partnership tends to be a concept that invokes ideas of contractual relationships between members engaged in a particular business. In addition, Martin et al. (1986) regard cooperation and partnership as more limited in nature than collaboration because they are often characterized by either formal or informal contracts. Contrasting the differences in terms, Martin et al. (1986) suggest that both cooperation and partnership should be seen as viable subsets within a collaborative framework, which they describe as follows:

> Collaboration is rooted in the notion that participating agencies and institutions come together for the purpose of identifying and solving problems of mutual concern. Each contributes to the process, and each is also likely to undergo internal change as a result of the process. Conversely, each is diminished if the problems are left unaddressed.(p.16)

Schlechty and Whitford (1988a) also consider collaboration as a broad concept that include three types of school-university relationships: 1) cooperation, in which one helps the other; 2) symbiosis, in which the two help each other; and 3) organic partnership, in which both participants work together in a joint venture for the common good. Their favorite type is the last one and they suggest that school-university collaborative efforts should move from symbiotic relationships to organic relationships.

Coalition

Coalition, like collaboration, is often used in lieu of partnership to describe school-university relationships. A good example is the Coalition of Essential Schools based in Brown University and co-sponsored by the National Association of Secondary School Principals and by the National Association of Independent Schools. The Coalition, as Sizer (1986) describes it, is a practical effort at the "rebuilding" of high schools, at making new compromises in the goals and procedures of schooling that will allow for better performance by students and more sensible conditions of work for teachers.

The Massachusetts Coalition for School Improvement provides another example of a partnership built on parity and designed to increase the amount and quality of student learning. The Coalition joins public elementary and secondary schools and the University of Massachusetts. Its emphasis is on working together to create conditions that promote school success for all individuals and all groups. However, there appears to be relatively little university involvement beyond the university-based director.

Cooperation

Cooperation is also often used interchangeably with partnership and collaboration or as a mode of collaboration. Intriligator, for example, notes that interorganizational relationships may be interchangeably called collaboratives, cooperatives, coalitions, and consortia and that they occur when "two or more independent organizations agree to pool their authority, resources, and energies in order to achieve a goal or goals they desire (Intriligator 1983, p. 5).

Other education theorists make great efforts to distinguish cooperation from collaboration. Hord (1986), in an attempt to synthesize research on organizational collaboration, argues that collaboration and cooperation are distinctly different operational processes. While they are both valued models, each serves a unique purpose and yields a different return. Collaboration appears to be a more complex process than cooperation and is highly recommended by Hord as the most appropriate mode for interorganizational relationships.

More recently, Cooper and Morey (1989) further clarified the distinction between collaboration and cooperation:

> [In collaboration] there is a shared purpose and agenda emanating from an issue or situation in which each partner feels a compelling interest. It may relate to only a single area of each partner's total domain of responsibility; each may be concerned with a distinct

> facet of it, but both institutions have some commitment to or interest in addressing it.
>
> Cooperation does not necessarily involve such a shared concern. It often can be accomplished with far less resource investment than can collaboration (pp. 14-15).

Like Hord, they are clearly in favor of using collaboration instead of cooperation to describe school-university partnership programs.

Alliance

Another popular term used to describe collaborative efforts between schools and universities in recent years is "alliance." Again, sometimes it is used interchangeably with partnership and collaboration, and sometimes it denotes quite different meanings from other terms. Gaudiani and Burnett (1986) define their "academic alliances" as a new approach to school-college collaboration. The alliance groups are local communities of scholar/teachers from both schools and colleges who meet regularly and take responsibility for their own professional development and for the quality of teaching and learning in their disciplines. Thus, the academic alliances, modeled on the concept of the county medical society and county bar association, involve only one segment of the educational establishment--the college faculty and school teachers--in their activities.

Lieberman and Miller (1990), on the other hand, use alliance interchangeably with partnership. They describe alliances as partnerships formed by entire schools with one another and with other institutions for the purpose of exchanging ideas, practices, experiences, and insights in the process of restructuring schools. Their conceptualization of alliances is much broader than the academic alliances model and is essentially the same as that for partnerships.

Consortium

This is a less frequently used term than other terms already discussed. When it does appear in the literature and in practice, it often denotes the same meaning as partnership or collaboration. The Puget Sound Educational Consortium (Keating and Clark, 1988), the rural consortium described by Ryan (1987), and the Arkansas Educational Renewal Consortium are examples of consortia which are essentially partnerships. For them, the consortia serve as a catalyst for change and for sharing resources and ideas.

Wilbur et al. (1988), however, equate "consortia" with "network," and view them as alliances of educational and cultural institutions, business and industry, educational associations, labor unions, and government agencies. They see the function of organized consortia or networks as helping provide needed services to institutions and to systematically and economically address an array of problems. In their general framework of discussion, consortia and network are simply one category of partnership.

Network

Wilbur's discussion of network is largely inadequate because both in theory and in reality, network can be quite different from partnership or collaboration. In Goodlad's lexicon, network is a very useful arrangement of exchanging information and ideas--as among boatbuilders, engineers, sociologists, teachers, deans, and so forth. These networks are characterized by likeness of interest or job and camaraderie rather than by confrontation (Goodlad 1988c). The National Network for Educational Renewal created by Goodlad is therefore not a "partnership" but a connection of partnerships in a binding relationship that facilitates communications about a common agenda of institutional and individual renewal. The importance of a network for school-university partnerships is clearly expounded by Goodlad (1984):

> Needed is a critical mass large enough to make a visible difference--a really sizable network of partnerships, if you will. Each partnership must be small enough to be conceptually and logistically manageable and large enough to include the essential components of the community arena--but no more. The network to which the partnerships belong must be a binding, communicating one sharing a reasonably common agenda. (p. 356).

While many of the school-university partnerships across the nation belong to one or another network which, if well organized and directed, can create a vital, critical support system for them, many others do not belong to any network. They may have to fight harder than those in a network to survive and to grow. It may be useful to conduct a comparative study of school-university partnerships between those who are part of a network and those who are not.

In his attempt to distinguish the various terms used in the literature on partnerships and networks, Clark (1986) points out that network is the most complex concept of all and has the greatest record of scholarly investigation. After reviewing the diverse origins and definitions of the concept, Clark concludes that:

> The term network is more apt to be used to describe relations between similar individuals, groups, or organizations. Partnership or consortium may describe relations between dissimilar entities--but not always. Networks are essentially anti-establishment. When networks become formalized, the line between a network and an organization becomes very blurred; therefore, those constituting networks need to beware of overly specifying governance, unless they seek the benefits of a formal organization instead of those attributable to a social network. (p. 21)

As Clark suggests in his review and analysis, one cannot say that a network is a network is a network, just as one cannot conclude that a partnership is a partnership is a partnership. One should acquire the skill to recognize the different conceptualizations of the same concept and the same conceptualizations of different concepts. Essentially, one needs to be aware of the different orientations of school-university partnerships, no matter what terms they choose to label themselves.

III. Orientations of School-University Partnerships

Although the idea of partnership is an ancient one and the experiments in school-university partnerships have mushroomed in the past decade, there is a lack of research in the field. Therefore, little is known about the different orientations of school-university partnerships. Educational institutions tend to jump into the ideas and experiments of partnerships without questioning where they are going, why and for what.

In a semantic review of the partnership concept in The Educational Resources in Circulation (ERIC), The Current Index to Journals in Education, Research in Education, and European Documentation and Information Systems for Education since 1966, Stoloff (1989) reveals that these sources have tended not to list "collaboration," "partnership," "alliance," or "league" as descriptors. The absence of focus on educational partnerships in these key educational research resources suggest that this area has not generally been a key concern or area of research interest. In recent years, the ERIC has included some descriptors on educational partnerships. At the time of this writing, upon inputting the key word "partnerships" into the ERIC CD ROM system, one can obtain information from over 1,600 articles and books published on this topic in the past ten years (including partnerships between educational institutions and businesses). This implies that there has been an increasing interest in education partnerships in recent years.

A study of the existing literature on school-university partnerships suggest that although partnerships differ from one another by the great range of their definitions, in orientation they can be classified into five categories: 1) staff-oriented partnerships; 2) student-oriented partnerships; 3) task-oriented partnerships; 4) institution-oriented partnerships: "adopt-a-school" paradigm; and 5) institution-oriented partnerships: simultaneous renewal paradigm.

Staff-oriented partnership

The idea of joining school teachers and college faculty for the purpose of professional socialization and development dates back to the late 19th century (National Education Association, 1894). It focuses on the professional needs of teachers, addresses the issues of how to socialize newcomers into the profession, how to keep teachers intellectually challenged and enthusiastic about teaching, and how to facilitate comprehensive and on-going contact between a variety of K-12 and post-secondary educators. Wilbur et al. (1987) identified an intriguing variety of such cooperative programs now existing that range from those designed to create "communities of scholars" within the academic disciplines, to centers for professional development and curriculum planning, to formal academic programs intended to extend the competencies of veteran teachers through institutes, colloquiums, summer programs, forums, and special degree sequences.

The evolution of the Academic Alliances concept (Gaudiani and Burnett 1986) provides a good example in the development of staff-oriented approach. Frustrated by the authoritarian, hierarchical patterns of modern organizations, a group of scholars based in the University of Pennsylvania began in the early 1980s to reconceptualize a more efficient, flexible collaborative structure that would encourage diversification, creativity, and collegiality among teaching personnel at all levels. They looked into other professions for lessons and found that at the turn of the century the American Medical Association and American Bar Association organized doctors and lawyers into associations that assured a general upgrading in knowledge and skills and created a more unified and respected professional profile for both groups in American society. At about the same time, however, local or county-level affiliations of school teachers followed the industrial workers' organizational model--the union--rather than the model offered by the learned societies in law and medicine.

In addition, the traditional hierarchy that has always separated school and college faculty--a hierarchy that values teachers in inverse proportion to the age of the students they teach--also contributed to the failure of the profession to organize its members into learned societies.

The demands of the information society require new structures in American education (Gaudiani and Burnett, 1986). To create new structures, founders of the Academic Alliances at Pennsylvania felt that educators should model on the original concept of the county medical association and county bar association to build "local communities of scholar-teachers" or "local communities of inquiry in the discipline." They advocated a distinct academic concept that encouraged secondary school and postsecondary faculty who teach the same subject in the same geographical area to meet regularly to examine the quality of teaching and learning in their discipline at the local level. Gaudiani and Burnett (1986) describe the key features of these staff-oriented school-university partnerships:

> A focus on inquiry enables school and college faculty to find common ground, to escape the "either-or" trap that has traditionally held "teachers" and "researchers" in separate camps.
>
> If faculty governance is becoming obsolete in the complex, fragmented institutional settings of most schools and colleges, the faculty in local communities of inquiry can retain ownership of the academic disciplines, their future research directions, the pedagogies that nurture them, the definitions of quality practice, and of malpractice.

> Faculty in communities of inquiry in their discipline foster a sense of shared ownership of the academic disciplines among local school and college faculty. Rather than settling for the older "parachute drop" in-service or faculty development programs planned and presented by "others," faculty in collaborative groups provide their own "sweat-equity" in the construction of opportunities for ongoing learning in their field. (pp. 1-2)

These features attracted attention from over 5,000 faculty members in a variety of disciplines in 45 states, who then created 150 sites--communities of inquiry in their disciplines (Gaudiani and Burnett, 1986). By doing so, they began to build a new faculty profile and reinventing a new academic life for the teaching profession.

Academic Alliances primarily facilitate inservice teacher/faculty professional development. Other staff-oriented partnerships include preservice programs for new teachers, which have traditionally necessitated close ties between teacher training institutions and local schools, although in reality they have often failed to effectively communicate with one another (Su 1989). Centers and programs now exist to foster interaction among campus faculty and teachers and administrators from the schools that make it easier to create and share instructional resources. Some programs have attempted to better integrate theory and practice in preservice teacher education, improve mentoring and supervisory practices in the field, and critically examine all aspects of the undergraduate experience for those heading for the classrooms of our nation's schools (Wilbur et al. 1987). In comparison with the inservice staff development programs such as Academic Alliances and the Yale-New Haven Teacher Institute, partnerships for preservice teacher training have been slow to develop, partly because the entire burden of preservice teacher training has been left to schools of education, and there has been relatively little professional interaction between college faculty and their school counterparts through the initiative of liberal arts colleges (Gross 1988). In more recent years, partnership programs have been developed to redesign initial teacher preparation programs. For example, the Comprehensive Teacher Education Institute funded by the California State University and the State Department of Education was recently founded for the purpose of reforming teacher preparation programs through a three-way partnership--a joining of efforts from school districts, academic departments, and schools of education.

In addition to programs for teachers, there are also school-college collaboratives consisting of institutes, academies, and projects designed to improve the education of school administrators. Most of these programs aim at increasing managerial effectiveness by improving leadership and problem solving, budget management, resource acquisition, community support efforts, and administrative monitoring of instructional improvement (Wilbur et al. 1987). Some programs, however, have tried to design a socialization process with a new focus and approach. For example, the Danforth Principal Preparation Program at the University of Washington has been using a cohort approach and building a consistent dialogue on the moral dimensions of education and schooling throughout the program. The program does not exist in isolation; it is part of the larger Puget Sound Educational Consortium--an institution-oriented partnership.

There is no doubt that the development of staff-oriented school-university partnerships or alliances has opened a new gate to professional preparation, improvement and renewal among educators at all levels. However, most of the staff-oriented partnership programs focus only on the professional experience of teachers, administrators and faculty members, but not on students, curriculum, programs or institutions. Therefore, they often have limited effects on the restructuring of the whole educational system. In fact, the inservice teacher/faculty development programs tend to take teachers and faculty away from the institutional settings so in need of renewal and away from the students they serve.

Student-oriented partnerships

This approach focuses on the students, but not on the faculty, or the institutions. It aims at raising academic aspirations and achievements of students, especially those with special needs and difficulties. There are many ways that separate institutions--schools and colleges--can work together for the advancement of student learning. There are three kinds of programs taking this orientation (Wilbur et al. 1987).

First, there are programs that seek to create opportunities and real incentives for precollege students to work hard academically, to "test the waters" before full-time college study, to explore various career options, and to understand the commitment necessary to be successful in a given field. The second type of student-oriented partnerships are those programs that focus on the educational needs of minorities and those students deemed to be "at risk." Wilbur et al. (1987) observe that many school-university collaboratives have been developed to address thinking, problem solving, and study skills; to provide better counseling, remedial assistance, and realistic job experiences to improve attitudes about work; and to improve the diagnostic and screening procedures used by schools to insure early identification of youngsters in need of special assistance. The third type of student-oriented school-university partnerships are programs and projects designed to help develop the full potential of youngsters identified as being gifted and talented. Typically, these programs also involve business and industry, and government agencies.

The student-oriented partnerships are clearly gaining currency; nearly 40 percent of the programs described in the *National Directory of School-College Partnerships* (Wilbur et al. 1987) belong to this category. In response to such rapid development, the U. S. Department of Education has established awards for school, college, and university partnerships serving low income students, and to support programs that improve the academic skills of public and private nonprofit secondary school students, increase their opportunity to continue a program of education after secondary school, and improve their prospects for employment after secondary school (U. S. Department of Education 1990).

No doubt, one of the ultimate goals of school-university partnerships is to serve students and enhance student learning. However, without fundamentally restructuring the learning environment, student-oriented partnership programs and projects could be reinforcing the existing organizational regularities and learning practices, some of which are known to be inadequate.

Task-oriented partnerships

The third major approach in school-university partnerships is task-oriented rather than people (teachers or students)-oriented. It focuses on specific tasks and projects in curriculum development, instructional design, and articulation between schools and colleges or between schools and workplaces. Under this approach, some partnership programs have tried to develop the entire curricula; some have prepared better materials for use by beginning teachers; others have offered seminars and regional conferences for teachers and college faculty to examine curricula by subject area, to work together to develop syllabi, course outlines, and sample instructional units, to improve student assessment practices, and to design ways to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction. There are also programs that exist primarily for the purpose of smoothing the transition for students moving from high schools to colleges and universities, vocational and technical programs, and to the world of business and industry (Wilbur et al. 1987). A common feature of task-oriented partnerships is that they tend to engage in piecemeal reform efforts that involve and affect only a small segment of the educational establishment.

Institution-oriented partnerships: "adopt-a-school" paradigm

This approach aims at improving and changing an entire educational institution, but the targets are usually K-12 schools, not colleges or universities. The word "adopt" readily suggests unequal relationships and one-sided reform. Typically, programs guided by this approach involve a local college or university, often in conjunction with local industries, to provide, in a paternalistic manner, lectures and workshops to students and professional development to teachers. Besides colleges and universities, many advertising agencies, newpapers, insurance companies, manufacturing firms, banks, sports teams, colleges, small businesses, police departments, even the U. S. Navy, have been involved in Adopt-A-School Partnerships (Wilbur et al. 1987). Thus, the idea has become a national movement. Usually only schools, but not colleges and universities or other sponsoring agencies, benefit from these programs. Clearly, the adopt-a-school idea and practice can only have limited impact on education reform.

The need for simultaneous renewal partnerships

All of the four approaches described above--the staff-oriented, student-oriented, task-oriented and "adopt-a-school" partnerships--have been experimented on an extended scale by various educational institutions throughout the country. They have offered new perspectives, built new faculty and student profiles, invented new programs, and stimulated new growth in American education. However, since most of them focus on only one aspect of the whole educational establishment (although some programs have overlapping orientations, thus having more than one focus), they have in general failed to create new, holistic visions for the future of education and schooling. Teachers and students affected by these programs may witness a change in some aspects of their educational relationships and experiences, but they cannot expect a fundamental transformation of their institutions.

In addition, impressions from the review of existing literature suggest that the partnership programs guided by staff-, student-, task-oriented and "adopt-a-school" approaches tend to be "one-way" or "one-sided" reform efforts, that is, the concern lies in the improvement of teaching and learning in the K-12 schools, but not in the restructuring of programs on the college campus. In many cases, the university personnel just want to lecture to the school people and then go back to their "ivory towers," but not to listen to the real problems in schools and on their own campuses. More often than not, the university people seem to choose to forget that they also need to restructure their own programs and that they need schools' help to do so. In reality, the universities may be in bigger trouble than are the schools, at least with respect to their role in the education of educators and the improvement of schooling.

The school people, on the other hand, generally view the collaborative relationship essentially as a vendor-vendee relationship. As Goodlad (1986) found in his conversation with school teachers and administrators, there is far more pessimism than optimism about both the willingness of professors to become seriously involved and their ability to be of assistance. And there is little on the university side to warrant optimism regarding willingness to go much beyond the noblesse oblige view of assistance to schools that has prevailed to some degree in the past.

In short, what the staff-, student-, task-oriented, and "adopt-a-school" partnerships are trying to do is to "repair" the existing schools here and there, by bits and pieces. However, when the educational structure and organization are fundamentally flawed, repairing is not enough (Sizer, 1986). What is needed is "rebuilding" and simultaneous renewal in both schools and universities. Goodlad (1986) presents a convincing argument for building simultaneous renewal partnerships:

> For schools to get better, they must have better teachers, among other things. To prepare better teachers (and counselors, special educators, and administrators) universities must have access to school settings exhibiting the very best practices. To assure the best practices, schools must have ongoing access to alternative ideas and knowledge. For universities to have access to exemplary settings and for these settings to become and remain exemplary, the schools and the preparing institutions must develop symbiotic relationships through joining together as equal partners. In the kind of partnership envisioned, universities have a stake in and responsibility for school improvement just as the schools have an interest in and responsibility for the education of those who will staff the schools. (pp. 19-20)

Institution-oriented partnerships: simultaneous renewal paradigm

The paradigm may appear to many as a "deviant idea" because it has been developed around quite different values and concepts from those underlying the other four orientations in educational partnerships. First proposed by Goodlad in 1985 for the establishement of school-university partnerships in the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER), this paradigm has been gaining momentum as a viable educational improvement strategy in recent years. It is characterized by symbiotic mutualism and simultaneous individual and institutional renewal. The key concepts here are "symbiosis" and "renewal." Symbiosis, as Goodlad (1988b) explains it, is a provocative concept:

> "Viewed positively, it refers to unlike organisms (or institutions) joined intimately in mutually beneficial relationships. For there to be a symbiotic partnership, presumably three minimum conditions must prevail: dissimilarity between or among the partners; mutual satisfaction of self-interests; and sufficient selflessness on the part of each member to assure the satisfaction of self-interests on the part of all members." (p. 14)

The idea of symbiosis has also been expounded by some other partnership theorists. Pine and Keane (1989), for example, view collaboration/partnership as a natural process like a symbiosis in nature in which two different organisms derive benefit from each other and guarantee the others continued existence. However, the symbiotic collaboratives described by Pine and Keane are ad hoc and temporary and seem to move on a wide array of fronts relevant to the interests of all participating parties. By contrast, the symbiotic, mutually beneficial partnerships described by Goodlad are long-term and deal with a limited agenda made up of from six to ten problem areas that have resisted improvement over a relatively long period of time.

Cooper and Morey (1989) also regard school-university collaboration as largely symbiotic in nature and synergistic in process:

> To be productive and resilient they require that the institutions involved clearly recognize their essential differences in goals, priorities, modes of operating, organizational dynamics, language and culture. Collaboration, if it is to be fruitful, also depends on the participating institutions resisting inclinations to co-opt each other. The strength of any collaboration lies in the sustained independence, district expertise, resources, and perspectives each brings to the partnership.
>
> ...Synergy denotes actions of two discrete agencies which when undertaken in concert with one another, produce a total effect that is greater than the sum of the two effects generated independently. Successful collaboration is marked by this process. (p. 13)

Although symbiosis is a key concept in the collaborative project described by Cooper and Morey, the major purpose of the project is to develop a practical model of support and assistance to new teachers, particularly those working with students from culturally diverse backgrounds, and to promote the retention of these teachers in such settings. What the university faculty and university itself can gain from this process, however, is not specified and, clearly, is not the focus of the project.

The concept of renewal in the simultaneous renewal paradigm derives from the argument for the school as the center of inquiry. Since the school is ultimately where students are taught, it is the primary unit of educational change. The process of renewal, then, as described by Sirotnik (1988), is "the ongoing involvement of the significant persons most affected by change in the development of innovative activities" (p. 179). Partner schools therefore must be first renewing schools.

The simultaneous renewal paradigm departs significantly from the conventional, one-sided reform methods which focus on effecting changes that involve and affect only one or two of the many groups of education personnel or one segment (often the lower levels) of the educational establishment. It proposes the building of long-term or permanent partnerships between schools and universities so that eventually the idea will become a natural function of both institutions. It requires that the participants redefine the role of education in a democracy, reconsider the desired function of schools, re-articulate the goals, substance, length and breadth of the schooling deemed necessary, make a fresh and firm commitment to both excellence and equity, and inquire how these can be forwarded simultaneously (Goodlad, 1987). In addition, the idea necessitates a shared understanding about the common agenda with clearly stated purposes for the partnerships.

Currently the simultaneous renewal paradigm is being tried by the 14 school-university partnerships in the National Network for Educational Renewal. Since the joining of schools (and school districts) and universities in commonly purposive and mutually beneficial linkages is a virtually untried and, therefore, unstudied phenomenon (Goodlad, 1986), the experiences of these partnerships can offer valuable lessons to education reformers. Several other partnerships, such as the "two-way street" school-college collaboration between Queens College and the Louise Armstrong Middle School, and the Benedum Project--a collaboration to improve education by redesigning both schools and teacher training institutions in West Virginia, are also engaged in similar experiments.

IV. Commonplaces of School-University Partnerships

We have learned that there exist different orientations of school-university partnerships. However, there are "places" where all partnership must stand commonly and address each commonplace from their visions for education and their conceptions of education partnerships.

The concept of "commonplaces" is not a new one. It has been used by several curriculum theorists in their discussions (Tyler 1949; Schwab 1973; and Goodlad, Klein and Tye 1979). Like curriculum, the partnership decisions and actions inescapably involve partnership commonplaces--by both omission and commission. Therefore, "commonplaces" can provide a useful framework for the examination of different partnership ideas and experiments.

With the existence of an impressively large body of literature on partnerships, it is relatively easy to discern the commonplaces for partnerships. It appears that almost invariably, from the time of inception, all partnerships have to address four areas of concern: purposes, structure, substance, and evaluation, despite the different orientations they have.

Purposes

When a partnership is being formed, nothing is more important than clarifying purposes for all those involved. Yet, surprisingly, institutions often join partnerships before those responsible for their destiny are clear on the purposes and potential benefits to be obtained from the newly organized cooperative (Goodlad, 1987). Consequently, the delegated institutional representatives often spend a lot of time seeking to uncover the initial purposes before coming to the realization that they must assume the task (Goodlad 1988a).

Clark (1986) observes that some authorities warn against getting hung up on defining purposes and goals. Lieberman (1986), for example, stresses the importance of paying attention to activities, not goals, in initiating a collaboration. Wilbur (1985) and Maeroff (1983) also believe that action is more important than machinery in the early stages of collaboration. Scholars also disagree on whether the purposes for partnerships should be narrow and specifically defined or broad and multi-faceted (Hathaway 1985; Shive 1984; Maeroff 1983; Dalin 1977; Parker 1977; and Schon 1977). These differing perspectives have inevitably affected the goal-setting activities of school-university partnerships. There are certainly no uniform standards, and no common purposes among most partnerships, although some partnerships, usually those linked by networks, share certain visions and goals.

Of the school-university partnerships that have explicitly manifested their purposes, not all use the term "purpose." Some prefer to talk about aims and goals; others like to call them missions; still others present agenda, objectives, principles, standards and guidelines instead of purposes. Moreover, some partnerships state their purposes simply in two or three sentences; others prefer to devote several pages to delineate not only broad, long-term purposes and goals, but also detailed, short-term objectives and guidelines.

In most cases, the partners in a partnership seek to establish common purposes or goals cooperatively, develop mutual trust and respect, and ensure that all partners have a common understanding of the different uses of language and time by the various educational segments (Galligani 1988).

Some partnerships go through an elaborative process of identifying shared goals, integrating complimentary goals, resolving conflicting goals, and developing specific objectives to satisfy collective and institutional partnerships goals (Gomez et al. 1990).

In the stated purposes and goals of partnerships, differences are quite evident among those who embrace different conceptions of educational partnerships. The staff-oriented partnerships have the direct goal of improving the quality of the faculty's professional experiences by establishing on-going and lasting contacts, exchanges, and alliances among faculty at all levels of education (Gaudiani and Burnett 1986; and Wilbur et al. 1987). These goals are based on two beliefs: 1) a flexible, collaborative structure should replace the authoritarian, hierarchical pattern in modern educational organizations; and 2) the greatest natural resource for the information age is the quality of mind of the people who teach in our schools and colleges (Gaudiani and Burnett 1986).

The student-oriented partnerships, on the other hand, aim at affecting students' experience in schools through enrichment and acceleration in their programs of study. Individual programs in this category, however, exhibit a wide diversity in purposes and activities (Van de Water 1989). First there are programs intended for enhancing the learning opportunities of "at-risk" students, most of whom are from disadvantaged and discriminated groups in the society. Second, programs exist that aim at creating opportunities and real incentives for precollege students to work hard in preparation for education and work after high school. The third type of programs is designed with the purpose of helping develop the full potentials of gifted children.

Great diversity and differences also exist in the purposes and goals of task-oriented partnerships, simply because there are many different targeted areas. According to the 1988 national survey of education partnerships in public elementary and secondary schools (Heaviside and Farris 1989), which include partnerships between schools and organizations other than colleges and universities, eight areas are targeted by the partnerships: math or science, reading or writing, arts or humanities, civic or character education, career awareness, dropout prevention, disadvantaged, and drug prevention. Overall, the largest proportion of partnerships targeted academic areas--31 percent of all partnerships targeted math or science (12 percent), reading or writing (12 percent), and arts or humanities (7 percent). An additional 17 percent targeted career awareness and 16 percent targeted character education. Smaller numbers of partnerships were designed to target drug prevention (7 percent), dropout prevention (5 percent), or the disadvantaged (4 percent). The survey also shows that more school principals would like to target these areas in the future. Partnerships built for the accomplishment of these specific target areas tend to have narrowly and specifically defined purposes and objectives.

The "adopt-a-school" partnerships usually set broad, multi-faceted goals for improving the schools adopted. The intention is to utilize university and other outside resources to improve the overall quality of life for teachers and students and to upgrade all aspects of the curriculum and instructional activities in schools. The responsibilities for the "adopting" institutions are heavy, and questions have been raised as to whether it is even possible to improve schools, if this approach does not work (Greer 1990).

Frequently missing from the goals of staff-oriented, student-oriented, task-oriented, and "adopt-a-school" partnerships is the most important goal of restructuring the entire educational establishment where teaching and learning take place (see, for example, Wilbur et al., 1987). Recognizing such negligence and summarizing lessons learned from a Study of Schooling and earlier experiences in building partnerships, Goodlad proposed in 1985 the simultaneous renewal paradigm for school-university partnerships. The intent, as he describes it (1988b), is to create a process and an accompanying structure through which each equal party to a collaborative agreement will seek to draw on the complementary strengths of the other equal parties in advancing its self-interests. Each partnership is a means to this end and not an end in itself. The central purposes boil down to just three:

> 1. The exemplary performance by universities of their educational responsibility to those seeking to become educators or to enhance their present performance as educators. (Increasing the usefulness of the university research function is a major part of this responsibility.)
>
> 2. The exemplary performance by schools of their educational function and the accompanying exemplary performance of school districts in providing the necessary support.
>
> 3. The exemplary performance of both universities and schools (and their school districts) in collaborative arrangements and processes that promote both of the above purposes. (p. 26)

These general purposes are meant to provide a basis for building a common agenda for the school-university partnerships in the National Network for Educational Renewal.

Another simultaneous renewal partnership, the Benedum Project in West Virginia, has also established as its main goals: 1) to create professional development schools and 2) to completely redesign the preparation programs for novice teachers. Furthermore, what they aim at is "not a fine-tuning or incremental change; it is a fundamental restructuring of the way teachers are taught" (West Virginia University 1990). Clearly, in the purposes of the Benedum Project as well as the partnerships in the NNER, we can see a focus on a core of values and a specific vision of what schools and universities should be. This vision defines the boundaries for restructuring for the partnerships.

Structure

The importance of the administrative structures for school-university partnerships cannot be overemphasized. It has been found that an essential characteristic of effective partnerships is the way in which the partners organize to work together (Galligani 1988). To a considerable degree, the development of partnerships between schools and universities--the two traditionally separate institutions--is a revolutionary idea and experiment because it necessitates structural changes in the existing educational establishment.

Failure to sustain partnership experiments often occurs when there is only oral commitment but no real effort to develop the necessary accompanying structure through which the partnership ideas may ferment. In many ways, the structure of a partnership, especially its governing body, with representatives from all participating institutions, provides a foundation for fostering and sustaining cooperation sufficiently strong to overcome organizational pressures that might otherwise serve as impediments to major reform.

There is a wealth of literature on how a school-university partnership can or should be organized (see, for example, Gaudiani and Burnett 1986; Goodlad 1988b; Schlechty and Whitford 1988b; Williams 1988; Keating and Clark 1988; Lieberman 1988; Sinclair and Harrison 1988; Gross 1988; Galligani 1988; and Gomez et al. 1990). In clarifying the concept of partnerships, Goodlad (1988b) outlines 12 minimum essentials for the structures of school-university partnerships that aim at simultaneous renewal: a governing board; a modest secretariat with an executive director; an opening budget; top-level endorsement and support; task forces or working parties; an orderly process within each partnership of endorsing and encouraging all projects and activities; an ongoing effort to document, analyze, and communicate successes and failures and possible reasons for successes and failures; the establishment and maintenance of a support structure within the national network; a deliberate effort to secure funding; redirection of existing funds in order to secure time necessary for educational renewal; and arrangement for sharing information, ideas, and even resources within and across partnerships (p. 28).

Similar, although less comprehensive, features in the structures of school-university partnerships have been suggested by Gomez and Associates (1990) based on their partnership experiences: an administrative council; a teacher advisory committee; long-term commitment; adequate resources; shared governance; stability; a focused action plan aligned with long-term institutional goals; a strong commitment to evaluation; sufficient comprehensive scope; and coequal participation in the development of project component programs (pp. 5-8).

Galligani (1988), in a qualitative evaluation of the California Academic Partnership Programs (CAPP), find that the administrative structures for partnerships serve as a primary partnership "building block." The CAPP projects were asked to identify the most effective way in which administrative structures could be developed in order to maximize the ability for partnerships to succeed. Four primary elements identified are: the establishment of an ongoing advisory committee; the development of clear expectations and goals; strong communication channels; and individuals identified as responsible for staffing, developing and maintaining the partnership effort.

The partnership programs portrayed in the existing literature exhibit a wide diversity in their governance structures. For example, the models in the College Board's Educational EQuality Project demonstrate a variety of governance structures: some have created boards of governors; some are led by advisory councils and leadership committees; while others are simply coordinated by steering committees (Van de Water 1989). Only a few partnerships have met all or most of the minimum essentials outlined by

Goodlad, or the key features described by Gomez et al. and Galligani.

The major difference in the organizations of partnerships with differing orientations, nevertheless, is a normative one--the extent to which parity is established between or among participating institutions. For those committed to symbiotic mutualism and simultaneous renewal, parity is a major concern and structural arrangements are made to ensure fully equal partnerships. Some partnerships embrace the ideas of mutual respect, shared governance, shared decision making, and co-equal participation in the activities, but do not realize the importance of simultaneous renewal in both schools and universities. True parity cannot be established and guaranteed in these partnerships because of the nature of one-sided reform efforts. Finally, if a partnership recognizes neither the importance of parity nor the necessity for simultaneous renewal, the prospect of restructuring cannot be too promising--the school may only expect some cold comfort or more of the same patronizing advice and services from the university.

In certain cases, a less organized and more flexible structure is created for partnerships. Lieberman (1988) offers a personal lesson she learned from the changing structure of the Metropolitan School Study Council:

> The flexibility with which we could adapt in terms of number of staff, roles, and activities was only possible because of our independent status vis-a-vis both the college and the schools. We had no significant office expenses, no important job titles, no activities that we could not change or drop. Although we had staff commitment to what we were doing, all of us were doing it part-time. Perhaps this may sound unstable and an example of poor administration to some, but it allowed us to shift and adapt to changing conditions, expanding when we had the resources and redirecting our energies when we didn't have them. (p. 79)

Partnerships with this kind of structure are loosely organized entities. They are flexible but also vulnerable because of the loose structure. They can accomplish a great deal or they can accomplish nothing; the structure poses no strains in either case. The chances are that when other commitments become demanding, the activities of the partnerships will be ignored or dropped if those involved lose their sense of responsibility and obligation.

One of the major reasons for the loose structure of many partnerships is that universities and schools are quite different kinds of organizations, each group with its own bureaucracies, finances, boundaries, and norms. To begin with, although the forming of a governing board can be easily accomplished by politically shrewd organizers, establishing a secretariat with an executive director could cause much controversy among school and university personnel because it involves both organizational arrangements and financial commitment. For instance, when the Puget Sound Educational Consortium tried to secure a tenured faculty position for the executive director, it met strong resistance from the university faculty. Eventually, through area meetings and numerous individual conversations, the faculty approved the new executive director's appointment. Thus, in the view of Keating and Clark (1988), what could have been a major break between field and college became a unifying action.

No matter how difficult it is, the development of formal organizational structures for partnerships should be a matter of paramount concern to all participants. Thoughtful deliberation and planning are certainly needed during the early stages of development. However, once basic structures are established, partnerships should take off the ground, and progress beyond this stage so as to get to the substance of what the partnership is all about.

Substance

Some partnerships may linger at the stage of initial structuring because of the expected and unexpected obstacles and difficulties. For those who move beyond this stage, they face an even greater challenge: to begin to experiment, with both hope and anxiety, on the substance of their ideas of school-university partnerships. Substance, therefore, is a commonplace that every partnership has to address.

Much can be included in the substance or the "nitty-gritty" of partnerships: processes, activities, interactions, communications, leadership, to name just a few. Of course, the essence of the substance of a school-university partnership has to be determined by the purposes or missions of the partnership. For example, based on the manifested purposes of the National Network for Educational Renewal, the substantive agenda for the partnerships in the network has been designed as follows:

1. The creation of exemplary sites in which future teachers are educated that demonstrate the best we know about how schools should function.
2. The creation of internships and residencies for educational specialists (including administrators) through which these professionals may observe and gain experience with the best possible educational practice.
3. The development of curricula that truly reflect the best analyses and projections of what young people need.
4. The assurance of equal access by all students to these curricula.
5. The cultivation of site-based staff development activities designed to foster continual school renewal, particularly of the curriculum and accompanying pedagogical practices.
6. The restructuring of schools to assure increased continuity of students' programs, decreased alienation and dropping-out of students, and more effective utilization of varied teaching resources, including technology.
7. The continuous infusion of knowledge relative to provision of good education in schools and in programs preparing educators.
8. The creation and utilization of opportunities to promote in the community a continuing, informed dialogue about what education is and why it has more to do with the welfare of both individuals and society than just preparation for jobs.

(Goodlad 1988b, p. 27)

The strength of the agenda lies in the wisdom it draws from the conclusions and recommendations by the major studies of schooling in the last decade (Goodlad 1984; Boyer 1983; and Sizer 1984). Partnerships in the NNER have tried to enter into long-term agreements to work on this substantive agenda. Although each does not address action to all areas, the entire agenda is advanced by several partnerships addressing each major theme, each in its own way but in communication with all other partnerships and in reference to the agenda as a whole. To what degree each partnership has been committed to the common agenda is yet to be evaluated.

Some of the partnerships in existence do not have a comprehensive agenda for action, partly because of their limited, narrow, one-sided orientations and essentially because of the lack of a clear vision of what education and schooling should be. For others, a common approach to action is simply to take on activities that already exist--that is, to follow the fashion or to join the movement--without necessarily understanding why. Very often they are also happy to exist in name only, without engaging in any substantive activities. Another solution is to take a conventional step-by-step approach to design a course of action based on the assessment of each partner's immediate needs, which may or may not contribute to the restructuring of schools and universities.

Evaluation

A moral imperative in a social experiment like school-university partnerships is that it be carefully monitored (Goodlad 1989). Most outside funding agencies also require evaluative reports on collaborative projects. Therefore all partnerships must address evaluation although their criteria and approaches may be different.

It is difficult to set common, fixed criteria for the evaluation of the existing partnership programs because of their different purposes, structures, and substantive activities. Moreover, school improvement projects often achieve outcomes in indirect ways and there are always unexpected consequences. In the short run, more often than not, we can expect the effects of partnerships to be small and difficult to detect because many of the goals and objectives aimed by partnerships are not easily measurable. As a result, school improvement projects have to focus on the evaluation of the process, rather than the long-term impact of their programs. For partnerships belonging to a same network, it is sometimes possible to establish common criteria, design common instruments, create similar processes of evaluation, and build a data base to share information gathered from evaluation.

There are several different approaches of evaluation of partnership programs. First, there is the prevalent, conventional model of evaluation as a process of management by objectives. Typically, a list of specific objectives is set in written form for a defined, short period (e. g., one year). At the end of the period, evaluation of the accomplishment of these objectives takes place and a new list of objectives is set for the next short period, and so on. Evaluation of this kind is often conceived and conducted as an independent activity separated from other components of the partnership.

Slowly but increasingly, a new method of evaluation--evaluation as an ongoing and substantive process or activity of a partnership has emerged in the past decade. Partnerships endorsing this method continually assess their progress while identifying strengths and weaknesses. A variety of methods is being used to carry out ongoing evaluation: case study, survey, interview, participant observation and documentation, etc. The indicators evaluated include both qualitative and quantitative measures. And both implementation and process data and outcome data are gathered (see, for example, Galligani, 1988; and Pine and Keane, 1989). Establishing databases for partnerships has become popular both on the local and the national levels. In data analysis, there is a strong emphasis on "thick description," which is obtaining real, rich, deep data that illuminate everyday patterns of action and meaning from the prospective of those being studied.

The results of ongoing evaluation are likely to be made available on a timely and continuous basis to partnership members and to other interested parties in the society. Self-improvement depends heavily on the use of such data.

The method of ongoing evaluation is particularly powerful in assessing organizational change and changes in fundamental beliefs, attitudes, and values. These are subtle and not easily measured variables. But in the long run, they represent the most important and most lasting effects of effective partnerships (Gomez et al. 1990). A commitment to longitudinal, rather than short-term, evaluation is essential to the success of such evaluation.

The internal, ongoing evaluation of partnerships is often accompanied by periodic external evaluation. Gomez et al. (1990) comments that objective, third-party evaluation has provided a useful view of their partnership programs which participants themselves or an internal evaluator would be unlikely to be able to provide. The College Board also actively employed "third-party" persons to evaluate their partnership programs (Van de Water 1989).

For some research-oriented partnerships like the Study of Stanford and the Schools and the School-University Partnership for Educational Renewal at the Graduate School of Education, University of California, Berkeley, evaluation has become an ongoing research activity. Data bases are established that meet the criteria for valid research while still acknowledging the organizational constraints of schools. The stated purposes of such evaluation/research are to strengthen educational research, to link practice-sensitive researchers to research-sensitive practitioners, to influence practice in the schools through collaboration, and to make recommendations to broader audiences in the nation (Nur 1986; and Gifford 1987).

A paradigm embracing the notion of ongoing evaluation but taking it a step further is evaluation as a process of critical and collaborative inquiry, developed and experimented by the partnerships in the National Network for Educational Renewal. Traditionally, gathering information, reflecting on this information in concert with others, making decisions, implementing these decisions, and then critiquing this entire process simply is not characteristic of the American educational enterprise (Goodlad 1986). Recognizing that the traditional canons of research and evaluation are inadequate for the purposes of simultaneous renewal in schools and universities, the founders of the NNER proposed a new paradigm for evaluation that encourages partnerships to engage in their own evaluative self-study through the process of collaborative inquiry. A central concept of collaborative inquiry is the legitimation of critique as knowledge-producing and effort-improving evaluative activity. A critical inquiry into partnership activities constructively challenges existing knowledge in terms of the values and human interests in the enterprise (Sirotnik and Goodlad 1988).

A variety of quantitative, qualitative, and critical methods are suggested for use in this evaluation paradigm. They include typical data-gathering techniques such as surveys, interviews, and observations wherein the data can be numerically coded and statistically analyzed; naturalistic/phenomenological approaches that ascertain knowledge through the interpretation of what is written, heard, and/or seen over the course of interviewing, observing, and reviewing archival documents; and conscious, systematic, and rigorous human discourse wherein 1)values, beliefs, interests, and ideologies in the educational setting are made explicit; 2) the need for information is generated; and 3) actions are taken, critically reviewed, retaken, and so forth (Sirotnik 1988).

Efforts have been made to implement this new, integrated method of evaluation in the partnerships in the NNER. Have they been successful? How effective are they as compared with other approaches adopted by other partnerships and networks? Should they be recommended to other partnerships? Will they be applicable to other partnerships? It is still too early to speculate on the effectiveness of this critical, evaluative method. But it is expected that the results of the ongoing evaluation of partnerships in the NNER will provide answers to these questions.

V. Experiments of School-University Partnerships

Various conceptions of education and education partnerships have influenced the development of school-university partnerships. Consequently, significant differences exist today with regard to the commonplaces--purposes, structure, substance, and evaluation--of partnerships.

Despite their differences, most school-university partnerships are still in their infant or toddler stages of development--they are experiments, not established practices. There are no compelling models or blueprints to follow. In describing the experimental nature of Coalition schools, Sizer (1986) points out:

> We do not share the assurance of those putative school reformers who merely impose new regulations without a period of honest trial. What we all are undertaking is complicated and must be carried out with an attitude of humility and determination. The restructuring we are engaged in deserves care in its design and must be given time for sensitive experimentation and for the identification of unintended consequences. (p. 40)

What follows is a presentation of several experiments on the ideas of school-university partnerships. Examples are chosen from partnerships with different orientations so that comparison and contrast can be made between and among these experiments.

The Comprehensive Teacher Education Institutes: A new model of staff-oriented partnerships

(California State Department of Education 1988)

Cooperatively designed in 1986 by the California State University system and the State Department of Education in 1986, the Comprehensive Teacher Education Institutes (CTEIs) have been functioning as three-way partnerships among school districts, academic departments, and schools of education during the past several years. Six CSU campuses and one University of California site are implementing CTEI programs. Two projects, one in San Diego, and a second at CSU San Luis Obispo, are in their final year at the time of this writing. Five new projects, in San Francisco, Chico, Fresno, Northridge, and Riverside, were in their planning year of developing proposals for 1989-90 implementation.

Although the seven partnerships vary in program design and implementation, they all share a common purpose: to implement reforms that had been demonstrated through research to be effective in improving teacher preparation programs--to make them more clinically based and responsive to the learning needs of California's prospective new teachers. Specifically, they must address the following goal areas:

1. Establishment of a collaborative decision-making process;
2. Articulation of subject-matter preparation, professional preparation, and field experience components of the teacher training programs;
3. Provision of an integrated curricular, instructional program which helps candidates develop expertise in effective teaching of diverse student populations;
4. Assessment of candidates knowledge and skills.

In addition, there are four optional goals:

5. Innovative approaches to postsecondary instructional delivery;
6. Recruitment of underrepresented groups into teaching;
7. Recognition of public service in the postsecondary promotion and tenure process;
8. Articulation between preservice and inservice.

(California State Department of Education 1988, p. 3)

Clearly, the CTEIs intend to meet more than the needs of the new teachers. Unlike some other staff-oriented partnership programs which focus only on the quality of professional life for teachers and faculty, the CTEIs want to be a catalyst for programmatic change. They were designed to serve as mechanisms for self-study, restructuring, and improving teacher preparation programs. However, missing from the goals of CTEIs are institutional renewal both in schools and in universities, and parity among the partners. Without a long-term commitment to institutional change and renewal among equal partners in teacher preparation, these institutions will find it difficult to sustain programmatic changes, especially after funding ceases at the end of the four-year period. The "proof in the pudding," as the CTEIs founders advocate, will be to determine how the developments in the CTEIs are ultimately to be institutionalized. A successful Institute, it has been predicted, will become a major influence in bringing about change and reform in the way teacher preparation is conducted. Nevertheless, these dreams will not come true until each partner school and university commits to institutional rebuilding and renewal.

There are no common agendas for action for the seven CTEIs, although each member is required to 1) review and assess the current teacher preparation program; 2) select mutually agreed upon Institute goals; 3) design an implementation plan to achieve the goals; 4) carry out planned reforms; and 5) participate in an internal and external evaluation of Institute process and outcomes. These steps cover all the commonplaces of partnerships: purposes, structure, substance, and evaluation. The CTEIs, however, are not required or encouraged to address these commonplaces in an ongoing process of critical and collaborative inquiry.

Because of the lack of a common agenda, the seven CTEIs have been engaged in different innovative activities in teacher education according to their different conceptions of what they want to accomplish in the partnership. For instance, the CTEI at San Diego State has focused its resources almost entirely on the development of an experimental teacher preparation program at Crawford High School; by contrast, the CTEI at San Luis Obispo serves as a catalyst for a number of initiatives and programs, including expansion of the cooperating teacher training program and the appointment of adjunct professors and public school teachers who serve in the teacher education programs; the Chico CTEI is committed to action research in its teacher Development Center; San Francisco State has a multifaceted approach in which five task forces develop integrated training and assessment activities for new teachers; and U. C. Riverside is planning to undertake a professional development school. All these activities are supposed to contribute to the accomplishment of the required goals of the project. However, since in the stated purposes there is a lack of articulation of a shared vision of what teacher preparation should be, it may be difficult for each participating program to relate its individual reform efforts to those of other programs and to the larger goals of the project.

In the spring of 1990, the CTEIs held a forum to share their experiences around the required goals (governance, articulation of preparation components, curriculum and instruction, and assessment). The directors of CTEIs and others discussed key implementation policy issues, which included the lack of concrete plans and the difficulty (resulting from the small size of the grant and the designated duration) for the CTEIs to initiate reforms in their contextual settings. The CTEIs do not exist in a vacuum; they co-exist with other institutional structures and therefore have to complement local readiness for change when implementing their reform plans. Again, institutional renewal seems to be the key. Institutional renewal, nevertheless, requires a larger vision and broader agenda (in that they address the fundamental issues in institutional change) than the ones designed for the CTEIs. Narrowness of mission and program characterizes many such efforts.

The Student/Teacher Educational Partnership (STEP): A model for the advancement of student learning

(Gomez et al. 1990)

Project STEP began by the University of California, Irvine, in 1983 by forming a partnership with a nearby public school district, the Santa Ana Unified School District, and four postsecondary institutions: U. C. Irvine, California State University, Fullerton, Rancho Santiago Community College and Chapman College. It is a student-oriented partnership that aims at raising the academic aspirations and achievements of students in a school district composed currently of 92% language minority students.

In the past seven years, the partnership has tried to provide students with a comprehensive and continuous system of support and curricular guidance from the elementary to the senior high school level. It connects instructors and administrators at the K-12 and postsecondary levels through a wide array of interdisciplinary and discipline-specific collaborative projects. It has provided parents with greater access to information about the education of their children and with programs that help them reinforce education in the home. It is opening the collaboration to include the business sector as an important additional resource of ideas and career guidance. And it has claimed great success in all these efforts.

According to descriptions by Gomez et al. (1990), this partnership has several characteristics. First, parity is a major concern of the partnership. The project is not structured in the traditional "top-down" mode and it does not cultivate a hierarchy of authority, value or expertise from the postsecondary to the K-12 partners. Instead, the partnership is administered democratically: responsibility for each component of the project is divided among constituents; postsecondary and K-12 educators and administrators work together as colleagues, sharing ideas and information on an open, often informal and always equal basis. The result is a sense of shared values and purposes and co-equal participation in the development of project component programs.

Second, although the overall partnership goals are focused on academic advancement (especially in mathematics and science), with special reference to the large number of underrepresented minority students in the district, attention is also given to institutional rebuilding at the school district level. As a result, the implementation policy issue faced by the CTEIs is less of a problem here. The school district is ready for the change implemented by the STEP. An evaluation of the project reports that many of the partnership programs have become institutionalized and become "a way of doing business in the school district." It appears that STEP is not an adjunct program within the school district; it is an integral element in the school district's goals and initiatives.

Third, there is a high degree of communication and trust among partnership constituents. The partnership views academic advancement as a complex process involving many people--students, teachers, faculty members, parents, business people, etc.--and many segments of the educational establishment and the larger society. The partnership thus addresses its goals through a complex web of intermeshing activities, highly organized but at the same time autonomous and flexible according to the changing needs.

Fourth, the partnership is committed to long-term goals. Therefore it does not rest on its achievements but moves forward to continued growth through trial and error. Many of the partnership programs are short-term ventures. They often fail because their impact is too narrowly focused, or because they cannot sustain their impact beyond a particular grant source. Also, change is focused more on the schools than on institutions of higher learning. But Project STEP, even after seven years of operation, is still a work in progress, committed to ongoing evaluation and long-term institutional goals, changing and modifying as it expands its goals and its participants. The project reportedly acknowledges the long-term nature of change and is committed to long-term collaboration. In its unique ways, STEP has become a model for other partnerships. It has received both state and national recognition for its achievements.

What seems to be missing from this partnership experiment, unfortunately, is the awareness that colleges and universities, too, need restructuring just as badly as schools and school districts. Despite the fact that there are four colleges and universities involved in Project STEP, the stated purposes do not address the restructuring of these institutions. The focus of this student-oriented partnership is on improving the learning conditions of students by rebuilding the academic programs in the school district. It has developed an impressive model for support services with particular reference to underrepresented minority students. It has not, however, developed any model for faculty renewal and for restructuring the programs on the college/university campuses. Simultaneous renewal of individuals and institutions at both school and college levels, therefore, has not become a shared purpose and activity in Project STEP. Although the partnership has taken pride in its persistence on parity in governance and program development, the partner colleges and universities cannot claim that they are on a truly equal footing with the school district without restructuring the institutions of higher education while reforming the lower-level schools.

Project STEP admits its limitations and is willing to modify its goals (Gomez et al., 1990). It thus has great potential for future development. If it draws lessons from the simultaneous renewal paradigm, it will no doubt expand its horizons and fulfill its potentials.

The California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP): A task-oriented model

(Galligani 1988)

When the current wave of educational reform first hit the nation in 1983, California state responded by passing a special omnibus educational reform act (Senate Bill 813). A year later, complementary legislation, in the form of California Assembly Bill 2398, was passed which aimed at developing cooperative efforts to improve the academic quality of public secondary schools with the objective of improving the preparation of all students for college. Subsequently, the California Academic Partnership Program (CAPP) was established to achieve this purpose.

Essentially, the CAPP has been developed to facilitate collaboration between college/university faculty and high school and junior high school teachers in curriculum development, which is designed to provide students the skills and information needed to make them successful in college. These efforts address improvements in curriculum for grades 6 and above. In addition to curriculum development, the CAPP also took on the task of developing and managing the administration of diagnostic tests in college preparatory mathematics and English composition.

Participants of the CAPP include branche campuses from the California State University and the University of California, community colleges, and public schools throughout the state. The major thrust of the CAPP is the development of twenty curriculum enhancement partnership projects funded for the first three years of the CAPP. These projects represent a diversity of approaches to curriculum enhancement in a number of academic content areas.

In 1987, a qualitative evaluation was conducted to assess the outcomes of the twenty curriculum development projects. The result is a comprehensive report describing the general characteristics which contribute to effective partnerships; effective administrative structures; best ways to promote postsecondary faculty members working with schools' faculty members; best ways to assist schools/school districts to enhance curriculum; effective ways to promote academic preparation efforts for underrepresented students; what are potential unintended outcomes; best ways to evaluate effectiveness of the projects; best ways to institutionalize the partnership efforts; best ways to disseminate information about partnership projects and ways in which the CAPP specific support structure could be most helpful to projects. The evaluation itself provides a useful model for partnerships in that it identified a variety of important variables which were measured by a combination of qualitative research methods.

The general characteristics which contribute to effective partnerships in the CAPP are:

1. Clear establishment of common goals which are recognized and developed cooperatively.
2. The development of mutual trust and respect among faculty.
3. The provision of sufficient time to develop and strengthen the relationships both among faculty and administrators.
4. The quality of the individuals, both in administrative and teaching roles, who have primary

responsibility for development of the partnership projects.

5. Continued and constant interaction between "top" management and the faculty directly involved in carrying out the curricular enhancement efforts.
6. The willingness to recognize and understand the different cycles and languages of the various educational segments.
7. Periodic formative evaluation.
8. Shared responsibility and accountability among the segments.
9. Crisp lines of communication which are inclusive of individuals within project institutions rather than exclusive.

(Galligani 1988, 10-11)

In addition to these general characteristics, the evaluation also identified successful ways to achieve curriculum enhancement as 1) meeting the needs of the schools; and 2) faculty working as a support group. The curriculum projects were especially effective in promoting academic preparation efforts for underrepresented students. The three primary ways are 1) specialized tutoring; 2) parental involvement; and 3) summer programs.

The CAPP curriculum development projects have reportedly achieved considerable success in enhancing the curriculum for student learning in California's public schools, especially for underrepresented students (Galligani, 1988). In addition, the partnership program has also tried to foster partnership relationships between postsecondary faculty and secondary school faculty in order to carry out the actual implementation of curriculum enhancement. The CAPP has offered many useful lessons to other partnerships, especially through the publication of its comprehensive evaluation report in the ERIC.

However, like the CTEIs and Project STEP described earlier, the primary goal of the CAPP's efforts is to effect change and reform in the public schools. Again, the necessity to simultaneously restructure and renew educational institutions at both lower and higher levels has been neglected by this partnership. The CAPP fully recognize the importance of shared governance and responsibility among partner institutions, be it at higher or lower levels. However, it has yet to realize that true parity cannot be achieved and maintained unless all partners are engaged in simultaneous, rather than one-sided, renewal activities.

Boston University and Chelsea Contract: Adopting and managing an urban school district
(Greer 1990)

Although the phrase "adopt-a-school" is never mentioned in an article (Greer 1990) about the partnership between Boston University and the Chelsea, Mass., public schools established under a contract signed by the university and the school committee, one can easily discern the signs of "adoption" in this partnership: a public school district in crisis and in need of guidance and fostering in order to survive; a large, independent university willing to adopt and manage the school district; and a contract that binds them together into a new relationship. There is also adoption within the adoption: a fraternity of the university has adopted an entire elementary school in the school district; it has provided tutors and will bring youngsters to the university campus and to Boston Red Sox baseball games.

Chelsea is a city that has struggled with poverty, emigration, and new immigration. The city has tangibly declined since the great fires that destroyed entire neighborhoods in 1973. The citizens' sense of community, aspiration, vision, and self-respect has frayed and people have lost confidence in the power of the community and the schools to bring events under control. School reforms have not been successful because people looked at daunting conditions and lost hope.

In this seemingly hopeless situation, Boston University signed a contract with the Chelsea School Committee to manage the 3,600-pupil district for 10 years. It is an act with the intention to ensure "that teachers are ready to teach, with the assistance of high-caliber in-service opportunities; that something important is being taught, with the creation of essential curriculum objectives; and that students are ready to learn, with the development of a broad-based health program and an emphasis on parent education" (Greer 1990, p. 32).

There is accountability involved: the university must annually report results to the state legislature, to a governor's oversight panel, and to the Chelsea community, as well as deal with the close scrutiny of the local and national media. The partnership also has to consider the grave consequence of the possible failure and ask itself: if the resources of a leading university cannot make a difference in working with an urban school district over a 10-year period, then what? There are more drastic measures that can be taken: voucher systems or state takeovers of districts in chaos. Or it is just impossible to improve urban schools. A future of failure is a very gloomy picture, indeed.

At this moment, the partnership is hopeful that its efforts will make a difference and and it will set up an example for the nation's public-school educators, universities, business leaders, and policymakers. Specifically, over the 10-year period, Boston University and Chelsea staff plan to design, among other programs, annual individualized learning programs for all students, a K-12 ethics-and-character curriculum, and home-based, high-tech preschools. The partnership also will address such issues as high truancy and dropout rates, low test scores, and low levels of parent involvement (Greer 1990, 32).

Several lessons have already been learned by the Boston University and Chelsea partnership in the past year: 1) every reform project either grows up or grows old; 2) certain notions of involvement, while understandable, can impede reform; 3) one way to make a difference is to change the ethos of the school system, not merely restructure the organization, schedule, and in-service opportunities; 4) the primary focuses for improving schools must be the quality of the teaching and administrative staffs and clear accountability for results; and 5) the success of any school system depends on the health of every newborn baby and skilled care for every child during the first year of life (Greer 1990, p. 32, p. 24). These lessons, especially the third one, has important implications for partnerships elsewhere. It means that a mere change of structure is not enough; the change of ethos or culture of the school is the key to success. Towards new ethos, the Boston University and Chelsea partnership has been trying to create a community of learners among teachers and administrators.

But can the ethos of the school be changed, even with the help of the university, if the ethos and structure of the university remain unchanged? Can the "community of learners" among school teachers and administrators be created and sustained if university faculty remain a community of lonely scholars? The probable answer is "no." Again, one cannot ignore the fact that the university needs restructuring just as badly as do the schools. Apparently, this is an issue that has not been addressed by the Boston

University and Chelsea partnership. The university is certainly keen on the need to change the ethos and structure of the educational institutions at the lower levels. To accomplish this goal, the university should also make efforts to start its own renewal process so as to set a living example for the schools.

Boston University is aware of the importance of developing and maintaining a mutual trust among the university, citizens, politicians, and teachers, as well as among the staff members themselves. It has, in an ongoing effort, sought input from the schools about their needs. But the partnership has not in any way encouraged the schools to seek input from the university about its needs and, subsequently, to help the university renewal itself. Sooner or later, the university will come to the painful realization that it too needs sincere criticism and help from the schools as the schools need criticism and help from the university, and that the restructuring of the schools simply will not take place unless there is a genuine desire for renewal in the institutions that prepare teachers for the schools. It will be wise for the university to take Trubowitz's (1986) warning seriously, "They (school teachers) do not want colleges to impose the very remedies they feel failed to give practical preparation for their jobs in the first place" (p. 19).

Puget Sound Educational Consortium (PSEC): An ongoing experiment of simultaneous renewal

(Clark 1986; Keating and Clark 1988; and
Puget Sound Educational Consortium 1990)

This partnership, described by Clark as a "newcomer on the block" in 1986, has been experimenting with the idea of simultaneous renewal for the past five years. It is one of the 14 partnerships in the National Network for Educational Renewal, which has established clear purposes for all the member partnerships: to provide collaborative vehicles for renewal and reform in both the university and the school districts.

Founded in 1985, the Consortium has grown to consist of the University of Washington and 14 Puget Sound area school districts. From the time of its inception, the Consortium has tried to implement the paradigm of symbiotic mutualism and simultaneous renewal. Having the advantage of being in the birthplace of these ideas, the Center for Educational Renewal of the University of Washington, the Consortium has obtained much momentum, guidance and strength from the wisdom of the educational leaders who created the paradigm.

In the first year of its development, the Consortium tried to organize its structure according to the "minimum essentials" proposed by Goodlad (1986). It also began to build an agenda and develop specific activities based on the NNER's common agenda for action. As a result, the PSEC identified six major functions: 1) interactive research on topics of common interest; 2) improvement of basic and clinical professional programs; 3) improvement of continuing education programs; 4) inter-organizational exchanges of personnel; 5) computerized linkages for exchange of information; and 6) advocacy of educational reform (Clark, 1986). These functions were then translated into collaborative projects, including the Educational Development Center, Professional Development Center, Educational Leadership Seminar, Danforth Principal Preparation Program, Principal Leadership Academy, Foxfire Outreach Network, Equity and Excellence Task Force, Ford Fellows Science/Math Project, Alliance of English Teachers, U. S. West Computer Linkage, and Educational Support Advocacy. At the same time, the Consortium anticipated problems in virtually all aspects of the collaborative endeavor: structure, funding, management styles, agenda setting, scheduling, involvment of university faculty and schoolteachers, mutual trust, and so forth (Keating and Clark 1988).

Five years have passed since the establishment of the PSEC. A comprehensive assessment of the Consortium growth from 1985 to 1989 has just been completed, in which seven basic question areas were covered: aim and goals; projects; resource allocation; organizational structure; collaboration; communication; and the PSEC future. Major conclusions and recommendations drawn from the summary of both survey and interview data in the assessment include the following:

1. The PSEC has experienced significant growth in all areas since its inception in 1985. There are positive examples of renewal and reform in both the university and school districts.
2. The Consortium remains an appropriate vehicle to accomplish the stated aims and goals of the organization and should continue for a second five year period beginning July 1, 1990.
3. The aim and goals of the Consortium should be reviewed annually on a planned basis. They should become more visible and be a significant criteria for the program of work.
4. While the aim and goals are the driver of Consortium activities, some latitude should be given to permit and encourage creative and innovative approaches to reform and renewal.
5. The role of the executive director is key to the success of the Consortium.
6. The governance structure is workable, but a review is necessary to find ways to handle organizational maintenance items without reducing the time available to spend on educational issues.
7. Consortium projects have grown in number, sophistication, cost, influence, and independence. Periodic review regarding continuation should be built into every project charter.
8. The membership size should not increase significantly over the current number for fully participating districts.
9. As the Consortium continues to grow, the budget process needs to be more formal and better understood by all who are involved.
10. With increasing size and complexity of operation, the Consortium would benefit from having written policy, regulations and operating procedures.
11. The degree of commitment of members to the Consortium varies for numerous reasons. Improved communications could reduce this variance.

12. The investment of time, personnel and services by Consortium members is key to receiving an adequate return.

13. A specific communications plan should be developed which states the target audience, the process, and the evaluated method.

14. A plan for ongoing assessment of the consortium should be developed and made part of organizational policy.

15. High priority items for the future would include a focus on school site reform; focus on UW teacher and administrator education reform; and the development of preservice and inservice professional development center.

(Puget Sound Educational Consortium 1990, pp. 7-8)

It seems that the PSEC has made promising, embryonic efforts in experimenting with the simultaneous renewal paradigm, and has achieved some success in its first five-year period. It has certainly become a frontrunner in building a simultaneous renewal partnership, although it cannot yet claim to be an exemplar. It appears to have succeeded where many other partnership experiments have failed; it has served as a moderately effective collaborative vehicle for renewal and reform in both the College of Education and the participating school districts, according to data summarized in the PSEC's assessment report (PSEC 1990, p. 45). PSEC also has as one of its high priority items for the future a focus on UW teacher and administrative education reform (PSEC 1990, p. 8).

The PSEC's persistency in simultaneous reform offers a good example because it is usually more difficult to initiate and accomplish reform and renewal on university campuses than in lower-level schools, as has been shown by evaluation results from some other partnerships. For example, in summarizing lessons from the Study of Stanford and the Schools, Nur (1986) expressed the frustration that while the partnership had achieved two of its original three goals--1) influencing practice in the schools through collaboration and 2) making recommendations to broader audiences on secondary education--the third goal--to modify the structure and content of the teacher education and curriculum programs at the School of Education was a far more difficult task to achieve. Nur found that reforming the teacher training program would require broad-based commitment from the faculty. The Study of Stanford and the Schools was too controversial among faculty to warrant commitment to institutional change because it represented a departure from the more traditional modes of research and so was regarded with caution by some faculty members.

The Stanford partnership experience helps explain why there are so few experiments in building simultaneous renewal partnerships between schools and universities. The obstacles are great, especially on the university campus. That is why the experience gained by the Puget Sound Educational Consortium regarding renewal and reform in both schools and the university is particularly valuable and meaningful. It is hoped that in the next five-year period, the PSEC will continue to grow in meeting its aims and goals, and will demonstrate leadership in finding solutions to the persistent and emerging problems facing the University, school districts, and all educators.

Beyond the partnership experiments such as the PSEC in the National Network for Educational Renewal, there are a few other experiments on the idea of simultaneous renewal partnership. Besides the Study of Stanford and the Schools mentioned above, a notable example is the School-University Partnership for Educational Renewal at the University of California at Berkeley, which aims at developing models for implementing institutional change that will encourage lasting improvements in educational practice at school sites as well as within schools of education (Gifford 1987). By creating a self-evaluating community of practice-sensitive researchers from the university linked to research-sensitive practitioners from the schools, the partnership has posed a significant challenge to the theory and practice of the existing educational establishment. Participants in the partnership have learned how to bring the schools into the university, how to bring the university into the schools, and how to bring schools into each other.

Partnerships in the experiment of the simultaneous renewal paradigm need to share their experiences so that they can benefit from the learnings and wisdom of one another. Together they can better inform the educational community what simultaneous renewal and reform is really about. They may also have the opportunity to form a critical mass large enough to become a viable, working example of partnerships for the renewal and reform in both schools and universities.

VI. Evolving Understandings

The examples described above should help the reader gain a basic understanding of the major approaches in school-university partnerships across the nation. Thanks to the growing body of literature on the various ideas and experiments of school-university partnerships, we now understand partnerships much better than before, and this understanding is still evolving.

We have discovered that there is no single paradigm, but several different orientations of school-university partnerships. We have also recognized four commonplaces that all partnerships must address. Moreover, with the rapid expansion and gradual maturity of partnerships, we now have the opportunity to learn about the developmental stages of partnerships, the characteristics that have contributed to the successes of partnerships, and the effects of the juxtaposition of two cultures--the action-oriented culture of the school and the reflection-oriented culture of the university. To a considerable degree, the future of partnerships will be shaped in our evolving understanding of all these important issues.

Stages in the development of partnerships

A useful framework for examining the progress of partnerships, according to some researchers and practitioners, is the idea of "stages" in the development of school-university collaboration. Trubowitz first proposed the idea in 1986. In his framework, partnerships go through eight stages:

1. Hostility and skepticism;
2. Lack of trust;
3. Period of truce;
4. Mixed approval;
5. Acceptance;
6. Regression;
7. Renewal;
8. Continuing progress.

(pp. 19-21)

Trubowitz conceptualizes these developmental stages in the same way that Freud and Erickson conceptualized developmental stages for human beings. He provides detailed analysis of each stage and offers advice on how to deal with the situations faced at each stage. To ignore these stages, Trubowitz maintains, is to invite disappointment, frustration, and possibly failure. He also warns that it is possible to reach a plateau at any of the stages identified.

An awareness of the stages, however, may help partnerships to persist in making them successful.

Many partnerships may find themselves going through the stages conceptualized by Trubowitz. Gifford (1986), for example, found Trubowitz's framework very useful for planning the "best next steps" of the School-University Partnership for Educational Renewal (SUPER) in the mid-1980s. According to Gifford's observation (1986), the SUPER by then had gone through the first five stages of development, but had not reached the stages of regression, renewal, and continuing progress. Being aware of what to expect in the next stage of development, the partnership intended to be sufficiently vigilant in monitoring change so that it would respond appropriately to each stage and learn well from it.

Trubowitz's framework is based on models in the psychoanalysis of human development. It focuses more on interpersonal than on interinstitutional relationships in the partnership. In 1988, two years after Trubowitz proposed his framework, Wilson, Clark, and Heckman--the three regional coordinators for the National Network for Educational Renewal--assumed an organizational developmental perspective and conceptualized five developmental stages that they believed the 14 partnerships in the Network were or would be experiencing:

1. Getting organized;

2. Early success;

3. Waiting for results;

4. Major success and expansions;

5. Mature partnerships.
(Wilson, Clark, and Heckman 1988, pp. 15-17)

This model focuses more on the institutional growth than on changes in human relationships in the partnerships. Like Trubowitz, Wilson et al. maintain that partnerships do not progress through these stages in a linear manner. They assume that not all partnerships move at the same rate and some may not progress beyond early stages of development. They add that there may be a sixth stage, which is a stage of decline and decay anticipating the demise of the partnership. Currently, with Soder, Associate Director of the Center for Educational Renewal, they are evaluating the progress of the partnerships in the NNER, using the framework of developmental stages as one of their criteria. They found that most partnerships have experienced Stages 1-3, and some have also displayed the characteristics of Stage 4. An awareness of where they are in relation to the developmental stages may help the partnerships to draw specific plans for action in the next phase of development.

In their report on partnerships for improving schools, Jones and Maloy (1988) identified four key stages for partnerships:

1. Identifying the diverse interests of the partners. This is the first critical point which revolves

> around the separate interests and core missions of the partners.
>
> 2. Agreeing on shared activities. In the second stage of development, partners arrive at agreement on some common means, usually toward diverse ends, and negotiating safeguards so that each party gains (although not at the others' expense).
>
> 3. Implementing joint programs. At the third critical interchange, basic issues of staffing, implementation, and administrative follow-through can be complicated by overcommitments or underfunding.
>
> 4. Planning for future efforts. The final point about cooperation and conflict among partners occurs when partners, while continually renegotiating with one another to reduce or avoid conflict, foreclose new understandings about what they would like to achieve. (pp. 100-103)

Clearly, Jones and Maloy do not view developing partnerships as a series of specific implementation procedures, but as a periodic emergence of "critical points." Moreover, they argue that:

> During these junctures, multiple perspectives and interests play out through possible scenarios that determine whether cooperation or conflict will dominate personal and organizational relationships. Implicit and explicit negotiations build toward dramatic resolutions, and partners must allow the process to be messy but not so confusing as to frustrate progress. (p. 101)

There are fewer stages or points in the Jones and Maloy framework than in those suggested by Trubowitz and Wilson et al. But their framework portrays a more complex and uncertain developmental process. Like Trubowitz, and Wilson et al., Jones and Maloy reject the notion of linear development, indicating that each of the stages has its particular potentials and pitfalls.

The emergence of different frameworks for the study of the developmental stages of partnerships suggest that the multiple realities in American school reform can lead to alternative visions and plans for developing partnerships. Each of the frameworks has its own perspectives and emphases, although they also share common characteristics. Together, they can help us better understand the partnership ideas and experiments with different orientations. While these frameworks lead us to believe that there are similar stages in the evolution of institutional structures, we should also keep in mind that the development of collaboration is not a straight line but a series of hills and valleys. Moreover, Pine and Keane (1989) suggest that the process of collaboration can be circular, iterative, and sometimes discontinuous.

Characteristics contributing to the successes of partnerships

As more and more school-university partnerships progressed beyond their initial stages of development in the past few years, they began to accumulate knowledge and experiences regarding what would work in partnerships. As a result, we now know much more than before about the characteristics contributing to the successes of partnerships.

Van de Water (1989) provides a summary of the governance characteristics of successful collaborative activites as claimed in the current literature:

1. Mutual self-interest and common goals (Galligani 1987, 15; Martin, Mocker, and Brown 1986, 5; Sirotnik and Goodlad 1988, viii; Vivian 1986, 62; Wilbur, Lambert, and Young 1988, vii).

2. Mutual trust and respect (Galligani 1987, 15; Martin, Mocker, and Brown 1986, 17; Sirotnik and Goodlad 1988, 60; Vivian 1986, 63).

3. Shared decision making (Galligani 1987, 11; Gifford 1986, 91-93; Martin, Mocker, and Brown 1986, 11; Sirotnik and Goodlad 1988, 26; Vivian 1986, 59, 75).

4. Clear focus (Sirotnik and Goodlad 1988, 59; Vivian 1986, 65; Wilbur, Lambert, and Young 1988, 41).

5. Manageable agenda (Bailey 1986, 21; Vivian 1986, 63).

6. Commitment from top leadership (Bailey 1986, 13; Galligani 1987, 15; Gifford 1986, 84, 92; Martin, Mocker, and Brown 1986, 5, 18-20; Sirotnik and Goodlad 1988, 28; Vivian 1986, 63; Wilbur, Lambert, and Young 1988, vii).

7. Fiscal support (Martin, Mocker, and Brown, 1986, 27; Sirotnik and Goodlad 1988, 28; Vivian 1986, 63; Wilbur, Lambert, and Young 1988, vii).

8. Long-term commitment (Bailey 1986, 21; Gifford 1986, 4, 84, 91; Sirotnik and Goodlad 1988, 28; Vivian 1986, 64).

9. Dynamic nature (Galligani 1987, 16; Martin, Mocker, and Brown 1986, 15).

10. Information sharing (Galligani 1987, 16; Gifford 1986, 89-90, 96; Sirotnik and Goodlad 1988, 28).

Informative as it is, Van de Water's summary nevertheless missed several important characteristics:

1. Shared vision of the future (Goodlad 1986, 1988b; Sizer 1986; Schlechty and Whitford 1988b; and Jones and Maloy 1988). Having common goals for the

partnership is not enough. It has been argued that successful collaborations require an educational leadership that articulates a shared vision of what education and schooling in a democracy should be. In the long run, this is perhaps the most important characteristic of a successful partnership because a vision of this kind helps formulate the long-term goals and common agendas for the partnership. Partnerships without a shared vision of the future are likely to be short-lived and narrow in focus in their goals and activities.

2. Symbiotic mutualism (Goodlad 1986, 1988, 1989; Clark 1986, 1988; Keating and Clark 1988; Wilson et al. 1989). There is evidence that mutuality in the traditional sense of the word is not sufficient for partnership development. Needed is the new definition and practice of mutualism as symbiotic relationships.

3. Simultaneous renewal (Goodlad 1986, 1988, 1989; Clark 1986, 1988; Wilson et al. 1989). Commitment to partial or total school reform will not bring about fruitful results if there is no commitment to simultaneously renewal in the SCDEs on the college/university campuses.

4. Ongoing process of evaluation (Sirotnik 1988; Galligani 1988; The PSEC 1990). Conventional evaluation and assessment methodology do not suit the purposes of partnerships. Ongoing process of evaluation in the form of critical and collaborative inquiry should and can be initiated in the partnerships.

In addition to a literature review, Van de Water conducted a survey on the governance characteristics of the College Board's Educational EQuality Models Program for School-College collaboration in 1988. Respondents were asked to rate 10 attributes of their models according to their importance to the model's success. The result is presented in Table 1:

Table 1
Educational EQuality Models Ranking of Attributes Important to Their Success

Attribute	Overall Rank	Overall Score
Strong leadership	1	8.97
Participant commitment	2	8.55
Focus on central issues	3	8.31
Governance structure	4	8.18
Financial resources	5	8.13
Balanced commitment (between postsecondary and secondary)	6	8.09
Support from the College Board	7	7.38
Incentives for participants	8	7.29
Support from parent organization	9	6.65
Contact with other models	10	5.76

(From Van de Water 1989, p. 11)

The list of attributes certainly is not complete, but the findings are still quite enlightening. "Strong leadership" is considered as the most important attribute of successful partnerships, although the differences in mean scores for the top attributes are very small. Strong leaders of partnership projects have been defined by Martin et al. (1986) as someone of enormous dedication and energy and:

> These persons' belief in the worth of the work, their ability to engender enthusiasm in others, their ability to write grants or otherwise secure funds and resources, and their vision of "what can be" give the projects impetus and form. These persons typically understand how to work within a system. Often they have had years of experience in service roles where

> success relies upon colleagues instead of cash, barter instead of bureaucracy. (p. 19)

In a recent assessment, the Puget Sound Educational Consortium (1990) also regards the role of the executive director as key to the success of the Consortium. The director is expected to be in close contact with all groups, and to be seen as an expert in the area each group represents. Therefore, it recommends that:

> The Executive Director of the Puget Sound Educational Consortium must possess qualities that will enable acceptance by a very diverse group. Considerable dialogue should occur involving those in various school districts and Consortium roles regarding the position. Once designated, the Director must be given sufficient authority and support by all segments of the Consortium to carry out the policies and activities that will bring the greatest success. (p. 75)

The second most important attribute on Van de Water's list is "participant commitment." This has also been the concern of many other partnership theorists. Pine and Keane (1989) offer a detailed description of how firm institutional commitment has been achieved in their partnership:

> 1. Through the collaboratives the university has appointed teachers as research associates whose primary function is to design and document local research and development efforts.
>
> 2. Participating university faculty are released for one-third of their time each semester to participate on site in school based curriculum and staff development efforts.
>
> 3. Intermediate school districts and the university share facilities, materials, and operational costs to support the collaboratives.

4. The university and the intermediate school districts release staff and faculty to provide personnel for staffing the administration of the collaboratives.

5. Local school districts contribute personnel by providing substitute teachers to release classroom teachers for participation in the collaboratives.

(pp. 21-22)

The experiences should prove to be useful for other partnerships, especially for places where institutional commitment to partnership is a problem or where there is great variance in commitment among participants.

Also rated high on Van de Water's list of successful attributes are "focus on central issues,""governance structure,""financial resources,""balanced commitment," and "support from the College Board." The two reward-related factors--"Incentives for participation" and "support from parent organizations" rank near the bottom of the list. They are, however, considered as one of the key attributes to successful collaboration by some other scholars (see, for example, Wilbur 1985; Hathaway 1985; Lieberman 1986; Gaudiani and Burnett, 1986; and Parkay 1986). Finally, "contact with other models" ranks at the bottom of the list. Obviously, the partnerships surveyed by Van de Water have not been very interested in establishing contacts with other partnership models. As partnerships progress beyond their initial stages of development, they may become more interested in learning about others' experiences--their successes and failures. Efforts should be made to build regional and national networks of educational partnerships and collaboratives so as to provide them with opportunities to contact one another and to share information.

It should be noted that most of the attributes identified by Van de Water have also been confirmed by other evaluative studies in recent years (Galligani 1988; Cooper and Morey 1989; Pine and Keane 1989; The PSEC 1990; and Gomez et al. 1990). In addition, Cooper and Morey (1989) identified "patience, perserverance, risk-taking, enthusiasm," and "self-regulated restraint on the part of all involved parties" as part of the important conditions for successful collaboration. It can be predicted that in the next few years, as partnerships grow into maturity, there will be more discussions, and hopefully some shared concensus, on the characteristics contributing to the successes of partnerships. An awareness of the most important attributes of successful partnerships also serves another purpose--alerting people to the existing problems. For wherever there is an absence of the successful attributes, there may be a problem that needs to be addressed.

Juxtaposition of two cultures

The initial successes of school-university partnerships have not come by easily. The building of partnerships is both a joining of forces and a battle of the opposites. It is, therefore, very much a dialectical process. The shaping of a shared reality out of different realities is never easy. Sirotnik and Goodlad (1988) describe a common core of issues that bear upon the quality of the interinstitutional relationships:

> top-heavy coordinating structures, securing adequate funding, conflicts between approaching symbiotic organizational relationships while balancing individual with institutional interests, using but not overly relying upon key individuals, getting something going while still attending to process, and, of course, developing functioning collaboration marked by shared philosophies of organizational change and school improvement (p. xii).

But how can the school and the university--the two educational institutions with different cultures and realities--develop shared philosophies of organizational change and school improvement? Clearly, this is a most critical issue in building partnerships between schools and universities.

To understand the nature of the problem, we need to examine closely the juxtaposition of the action-oriented culture of the school and the inquiry-oriented culture of the university in school-university partnerships. It seems that this juxtaposition has resulted in both promises and problems. The promises lie in the force of the joining cultures to shake loose the calcified programs of both (Goodlad, 1987). As Goodlad observes, the most significant changes occur when two cultures bump against one another (Olson 1987, pp. 1, 5).

On the other hand, the distinction between the two cultures has created walls, barriers, and complications in school-university partnerships. It is unfortunate that in the history of American education, school teachers and college/university professors have not been viewed as members in the same education profession (Su, 1986). Professors are known as members of the academic profession while schoolteachers are considered as members of the teaching profession. There is always the argument on whether teaching in public schools qualifies as a profession, but there is seldom doubt about the validity of the academic profession.

Gaudiani and Burnett (1986) explored a wide variety of myths and presumptions that have worked against school-college collaboration since the turn of the century. "Teachers teach students and faculty teach subjects." "All college faculty are scholars who live in ivory towers surrounded by a threat of 'publish or perish.'" "High school teachers have baccalaureate degrees and professors have Ph.D.'s." And so on. Consequently, the culture and professional demands of school teaching tend to encourage a generalist knowledge of the discipline, while the culture and demands on college teaching reward specialization. When they work together in a partnership, they begin to share some elements of each others' cultures. However, they have to overcome many hurdles, including:

> 1. Different orientations toward time. The university focus on the pursuit of knowledge encourages time for reflection and analysis whereas school people more often feel an urgency to act, resulting in impatience when faculty think in terms of a year or two for problem study.
>
> 2. Different competencies academics and practitioners bring to the problem-solving process. University faculty are skilled in handling data and conceptualizing issues. School personnel, on the other hand, provide a contextual flavor by articulating the organizational realities of schooling.
>
> 3. Differences in motivation. Researchers find the probing of new areas of study rewarding whereas school people are recognized for managing complex organizations.
>
> (Nur 1986, 45)

All of these and other differences can produce dissonance in the early stages of establishing an effective working relationship. But the biggest hurdle is perhaps what Gross (1988) describes as a patronizing posture on the part of the college community toward teachers. The dilemma that can be caused by the "patronizing posture" of the college community is best illustrated by Sarason, as quoted in Trubowitz (1984):

> In contrast to people in the school culture, faculty in the college or university culture have a far better opinion of themselves. Our centers of higher education have grown in size, support, and status since World War II. In the scores of studies done on the degree of respect and status accorded the different professions, university professors have always been near or at the top and school personnel near or at the bottom of the scale. That difference has not gone unnoticed by professors or school personnel. Unfortunately, professors tend to take this difference (and themselves very seriously. When they work with school personnel, they tend to expect and to structure relationships in terms of superior-inferior, teacher-student roles. There is something self-defeatingly seductive in the role of "expert," not only for the ambivalence it

> engenders in the nonexpert (better yet, inexpert) but [for] the insensitivity it can produce in people and their settings. Generally speaking, college faculty truly want to be effective. The problem is that the value judgments inherent in the distinction between "higher" and "lower" education--one is better, or more important, or more socially worthy than the other--are mirrored in the way relationships between people in the two cultures are perceived and structured when they interact (p. 20).

Sarason's insightful analysis helps explain why some partnerships have not even tried to achieve parity in schoolteacher-faculty member relationships; why some collaborations have failed to build partnerships of true equals even when they try hard to reach the goal; why there is the attitude that schools need reform and need universities' help in that matter while universities do not need renewal or schools' help; and why it is so difficult for partnerships to develop a shared philosophy on organizational change and educational reform.

To date there is no viable model of a partnership that has achieved true parity among all its partners. However, the ideas and experiments of symbiotic mutualism and simultaneous renewal have offered promises of creating partnerships of true equals. To succeed, they still have to overcome many hurdles resulting from differences between the school culture and the university culture. If they succeed, they will have the opportunity to bridge the different cultures in the school and the university, to shape a shared fate in educational renewal and reform, and to pave the road for the creation of an equitable, constructive and productive new culture--a culture of school-university partnership.

VII. Conclusion: Toward a Culture of School-University Partnership

The rapid evolution of school-university partnerships in recent years demonstrates that schools and universities can work together cooperatively. Haberman's (1971) earlier claim that schools and universities cannot be expected to do so because of their different cultures has to be modified today. Nevertheless, partnership development has not been and will not be smooth-sailing. As in marriage, some will persevere and become lifelong partners; but some will break up and go their own ways. Much depends on their orientations, commitments and efforts.

In this paper, I have explored different ideas, orientations and experiments in school-university partnerships, identifed certain commonplaces that all partnerships must address, and summarized evolving understanding about the developmental stages, the possible successful characteristics, and the juxtaposition of two cultures in the partnerships. Among all the paradigms under review, the paradigm of symbiotic mutualism and simultaneous renewal seems to offer the best promise for renewal and reform in both the schools and the universities. The strength of the paradigm lies in its shared philosophy of organizational change and educational reform, which is based on a redefinition of the role of education in a democracy, a clear delineation of the desired function of schools in this process, a clear articulation of the goals, substance, length, and breadth of the schooling deemed necessary, and a fresh commitment to both excellence and equity.

Assuming that the simultaneous renewal paradigm will prevail and partnerships currently experimenting on this paradigm will grow from their present infant and toddler stages into maturity, can we then expect the creation of a new partnership culture--a merge of the school culture and the university culture?

If we dwell on the differences between the school and the university, we would perhaps say "no" to the question. We already know that as separate educational entities, the school and the university differ not in degree but in kind. They differ in purpose, function, structure, clientele, reward system, rules and regulations, ambience, and ethos. In short, schools and universities are markedly different cultural entities (Sirotnik and Goodlad 1988, 14). Such differences or dissimilarities are actually one of the three necessary conditions of a symbiotic relationship. Because they are different, they can create productive tensions and promote the growth of partnerships when they bump into each other.

On the other hand, when we think about their shared purposes in restructuring schools and the preparation of educators, we can be persuaded into believing that there is a great possibility for the culture of the school and the culture of the university to merge into one in a partnership that is greater than its parts. Goodlad (1986), in conceptualizing the simultaneous renewal paradigm, anticipates that the culture of the school and the culture of the university will merge in creating a new cultural entity made up of part of each while pursuing their own identities. Furthermore, he envisions this kind of partnership to be long-term in nature, perhaps permanent. What he envisions is not just a project in the reform of schooling or teacher education, but a way of life: a joining of schools and schools of education in a permanent partnership. A way of life necessarily has its own culture--its own norms and behaviors. In time, the partnership structure may disappear, but the partnership culture will stay.

Schlechty and Whitford (1988b) make a cogent argument for the building of a partnership culture and call it "a common culture." They are convinced that the culture of the school and the culture of the university go beyond interaction; they merge. Furthermore, they maintain that:

> a common culture cannot be a by-product of collaboration; it should be its primary goal--in other words, the symbiotic must evolve into the organic. The systematic and continuous improvement of the quality of

> education cannot occur until education becomes a progressive profession rather than a traditional-based craft. And, education cannot become a progressive profession until those who prepare educators and those who practice in the field are bound by a common culture. The building of this common culture requires that those who now function on university campuses and those who practice in the schools join together in a common organization with sufficient autonomy from the organizations they now serve to work out their common destiny (p. 202).

Developing a common culture, then, becomes the primary goal of partnerships. In fact, throughout their argument for building organic collaboration, Schlechty and Whitford (1988b) stress the "common" over the "different." They refer frequently to "common interests," "common good," "shared problems," and "shared vision."

The merging of the school culture and the university culture has also been envisioned by Pine and Keane (1989). When a new culture of school-university partnership is created, they predict, the relationship between public schools, colleges, and universities can be developed to the point where each is considered an extension of the other in regard to teacher education and the improvement of schools.

In summarizing their experiences in developing the Student/Teacher Educational Partnership (STEP), Gomez et al. (1990) boldly claim that STEP has already achieved a partnership culture by ensuring that every aspect of its administrative and pedagogical approach is infused with the fundamental partnership values: shared governance, open communication and coequal representation. Moreover, they consider the emerging new culture a "strong supporting culture separate from the specific partner institutions." Essentially, they conceptualize the partnership as a separate culture itself, with its own norms, language and behaviors. This separate, supporting culture has had several important effects on the development of STEP:

> 1. Partners are secure to communicate concerns about their own institutions, to face problems, knowing that the partnership culture is designed to remediate these problems.
> 2. The partnership provides a strong support structure for the "risk-takers" who initiate and carry through educational change.
> 3. The partners may adopt specific norms from each other by means of the partnership culture.
>
> (pp. 56-57)

In reality, the development of a partnership culture is more complicated than is described by Gomez et al. For example, one cannot totally separate the partnership culture from the cultures of the partner institutions because it grows from these cultures. In this sense, it is perhaps more a "common", rather than a "separate," culture. Moreover, a culture represents a way of life and cannot be limited to just a few functions.

Building partnership culture is a new topic still in the partnership literature. We have come to recognize the importance of building the partnership culture but we still know very little about the necessary processes for creating the partnership culture except that they are neither simple nor easy. They will constitute, of course, the major unknowns and challenges in the future social experiments of school-university partnerships.

A major challenge may be the lack of so called "boundary spanners,""intermediate engineers,""liaisons"--individuals who can move back and forth between the schools and the university and who have an understanding of both cultures (Clark 1986, pp. 98-99). The importance of such individuals is obvious, but there is little in the literature that is directly related to the role of such individuals in school-university relationships. Commenting on this unsatisfactory situation, Clark (1986) posed several penetrating questions about these individuals:

> Are there academic qualifications?
> Must they have work experience in both camps?
> What do those individuals who succeed in this role do as they interact with people in the schools and universities?
> Can such individuals be deliberately cultivated?
> (p. 103)

There are still no clear answers to these important questions. Since we may have to rely heavily on such individuals in creating a partnership culture, we need to find the answers quickly. The existing partnerships should make an effort to identify and cultivate such individuals.

The creation of an equitable and constructive school-university partnership culture will have far-reaching significance not only for educational reform, but also for social change in our era. In *Habits of the Heart*, Robert Bellah analyzes the fragmentation of society into what he calls "the culture of separation." In many ways American education is a reflection of that culture. Public schoolteachers as well as college and university faculty members share the sense of isolation that comes from working alone and in the same way day after day, month after month (Lortie 1975; Trubowitz 1986). Schools and universities also have been operating as separate entities even in the preparation of future educators.

It is hoped that the creation of school-university partnership cultures will help tear down the walls of "separation" in the American society by providing a working example of cultural coherence and integration. In the end, the present dominant, hierarchical society may be replaced by a partnership society. The future ahead of us may very well witness a return to "the partnership society of the forgotten past", as Eisler (1987) predicts. Therefore, let us be alert and have an eye out for our partners--the key ingredients of a healthy ecosystem.

Bibliography

Agne, Russell M. and Edward R. Ducharme. "New Incentives for Public School-Higher Education Partnerships." Journal of Curriculum and Supervision 3(4) (Summer 1988): 335-43.

Askins, Billy E. and Jean A. Schwisow. "A University-School Partnership for Providing Inservice Staff Development to a Rural School: The Greenwood Experience." Journal of Staff Development 9(4) (Fall 1988): 40-44.

Bailey, Adrienne Y. "More than Good Intentions: Building a Network of Collaboratives." Education and Urban Society 19(1) (November 1986): 7-23.

Bellah, Robert N. et al. Habits of the Heart. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985.

Boyer, Ernest. High School. New York: Harper & Row, 1983.

_____. "The Need for School-College Collaboration." Higher Education and National Affairs. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1985.

California State Department of Education. Request for Proposals: Comprehensive Teacher Education Institutes. Sacramento, CA.: Author, 1988.

Cetron, M. Schools of the Future. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983.

Clark, Richard W. School/University Relations: Partnerships and Networks. Occasional Paper No. 2. Seattle, WA.: Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington: 1986.

Cohen, Sol (ed.). Education in the United States: A Documentary History. New York: Random House, 1974.

College Board. Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and Be Able to Do. New York: College Board, 1983.

Comer, J. School Power: Implications of an Intervention Program. New York: The Free Press, 1980.

Cooper, Mary G. and Ann I. Morey. "Balancing Acculturation to the Profession and Acclimation to the School District through a University-School District Collaborative Induction Program." Sacramento, CA.: California State Department of Education, 1989. ED 306871.

Dalin, P. "Network for Educational Change." Washington, D. C.: NIE, 1977.

Dewey, John. School and Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1990.

Eisler, Raine. The Chalice and the Blade: Our History, Our Future. New York: Harper & Row, 1987.

Eurich, N. Corporate Classroom: The Learning Business. Princeton, NJ.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1985.

Fowler, Judy and Stefan Martin. "School-College Partnerships and Their Impact on Writing Programs." Writing Program Administration 12(3) (Spring 1989): 43-56.

Frazier, Calvin M. An Analysis of a Social Experiment: School-University Partnerships in 1988. Occasional Paper No. 6. Seattle, WA.: Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington, 1988.

Galligani, Dennis J. "Effective Relationships for School/College Partnerships: A Qualitative Evaluation of the Curriculum Enhancement Projects Participating in the California Academic Partnership Program 1984-1987." Long Beach, CA.: California State University, Office of the Chancellor, 1987.

_____. "School/College Partnerships to Enhance Curriculum: A Statewide Qualitative Evaluation." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the AERA. New Orleans, April, 1988. ED 294928.

Gaudiani, Claire L., and David G. Burnett. Academic Alliances A New Approach to School/College Collaboration. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1985/86.

Gies, Frederick, and William M. Gordon. "Dilemmatic Consequences of a Collaborative School/University Renewal Project," National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision (1990).

Gifford, Bernard R. "The Evolution of School-University Partnership for Educational Renewal." Education and Urban Society 19(1) (November 1986): 77-106.

_____. "Images, Recommendations, and Best Next Steps." Education and Urban Society 19(4) (1987): 421-40.

Gomez, Manuel N., Joan Bissell, Lesley Danziger, and Robin Casselman. A Handbook on Implementing Effective Public School-Postsecondary Partnerships. Irvine, CA: University of California, Irvine in conjuction with Santa Ana Unified School District, California State University, Fullerton, and Rancho Santiago College, 1990.

Goodlad, John I. "Teacher Education beyond the Crossroads." In The Education of Teachers: New Perspectives. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1958.

_____. A Place Called School. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.

_____. Linking Schools and Universities: Symbiotic Partnerships. Occasional Paper No. 1. Seattle, WA.: Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington, 1986.

_____. "Schools and Universities Can and Must Work Together," Principal (September, 1987): 9-15.

_____. "School-University Partnerships: A Social Experiment," Record (Spring, 1988a): 77-80.

_____. "School-University Partnerships for Educational Renewal: Rationale and Concepts." In Sirotnik and Goodlad (eds.), School-University Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases, and Concerns, (1988b), 3-31.

_____. The National Network for Educational Renewal: Past, Present, Future. Occasional Paper No. 7. Seattle, WA.: Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington, 1988c.

_____. "The NNER: Past, Present, Future." NNER News, 3(1) (Spring, 1989): 1-4.

Goodlad, John I., M. Frances Klein, and Kenneth A. Tye. "The Domains of Curriculum." In Curriculum Inquiry: The Study of Curriculum Practice by John I. Goodlad and Associates. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979.

Greer, Peter R. "Boston University and Chelsea: First Lessons." Education Week (May 16, 1990):32, 24.

Gross, Theodore L. Partners in Education: How Colleges Can Work with Schools to Improve Teaching and Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1988.

Haberman, M. "Twenty-Three Reasons Why Universities Can't Educate Teachers." Journal of Teacher Education 22 (1971): 133-40.

Hathaway, W. E. "Models of School-University Collaboration: National and Local Perspectives on Collaborations That Work." Paper presented for symposium at the annual meeting of AERA, Chicago, March 1985. ED 253 973.

Heaviside, Sheila, and Elizabeth Farris. Educational Partnerships in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools Survey Report. Washington, D. C.: National Center for Educational Statistics, 1989.

Hord, S. M. "A Synthesis of Research on Organizational Collaboration." Educational Leadership (February 1986): 22-26.

Intriligator, B. A. "Evaluating Inter-Organizational Relationships." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, 1983.

Jones, Byrd L. and Robert W. Maloy. Partnerships for Improving Schools. Westport, CT.: Greenwood Press Inc., 1988.

Keating, Pamela J., and Richard W. Clark. "Accent on Leadership: The Puget Sound Educational Consortium." In Kenneth A. Sirotnik and John I. Goodlad (eds.), School-University Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases, and Concerns (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988): 148-66.

Lieberman, Ann. "Collaborative Work." Educational Leadership (February 1986): 4-8.

_____. "The Metropolitan School Study Council: A Living History." In Kenneth A. Sirotnik and John I. Goodlad (eds.), School-University Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases, and Concerns (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988): 69-86.

Lieberman, Ann and Lynne Miller. "Restructuring Schools: What Matters and What Works." Phi Delta Kappan 71(10) (June 1990): 759-764.

Lortie, Dan C. Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Maeroff, Gene I. School and College: Partnerships in Education. Princeton, NJ.: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1983.

Martin, Deanna C., and Others. Joining Forces for Urban Youth. The NASULGC Urban University/Urban School Collaborative Program. A Final Report. Washington, D.

C.: National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, 1986. ED296043.

McLaughlin, Mike. "The K-College Project in Sonoma County, California: Developing a University-Public School System Academic Partnership," Journal of Educational Public Partnership 10(2) (1987): 32-33.

Moore, Hollis A. "Elements in the Teacher Education Program: Professional Preparation." In The Education of Teachers: New Perspectives. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1958.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform. Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Excellence, 1983.

National Education Association. NEA Addresses: 1894 Proceedings, Vol. 33. Asbury Park, NJ.: 1894.

National Science Board Commission on Precollege Education in Mathematics, Science and Technology. Educating Americans for the 21st Century. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1983.

Nur, Mary M. "The Role of Research-Oriented Universities in School Change," Education and the Urban Society 19(1) (November 1986):42-58.

Olson, L. "Network for Renewal: Goodlad Seeks Stronger School-University Alliances." Education Week (April 8, 1987): 1, 5-6.

Parkay, F. W. "A School/University Partnership That Fosters Inquiry-Oriented Staff Development." Phi Delta Kappan (January 1986): 386-89.

Parker, L. Networks for Innovation and Problem-Solving and Their Use for Improving Education: A Comparative Overview. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Education, Group on School Capacity for Problem-Solving, 1977.

Pine, Gerald J. and William G. Keane. "Tearing down the Wall: Collaboration for Educational Excellence and Equity." Spectrum: Journal of School Research and Information, 3(4) (Winter 1986): 1-10.

Pine, Gerald J. and William G. Keane. Collaboration for Educational Excellence and Equity: Lessons Learned. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the AACTE. Anaheim, CA., March, 1989.

Poutler, Albert J. Jr. "Three Books on Partnership in Practice." Phi Delta Kappan 71(10) (June 1990): 816, 818.

Puget Sound Educational Consortium. Puget Sound Educational Consortium: Assessment 1985-1989. Seattle, WA.: Author, 1990.

Ruddick, Jean, and Brian Wilcox. "Issues of Ownership and Partnership in School-Centered Innovation: The Sheffield Experience." Research Papers in Education 3(3) (October 1988): 157-79.

Ryan, Charles W. et al. "School Partnerships in Education: A Rural Consortium." Paper presented at the National Rural and Small School Conference. Washington, D. C.: October, 1987. ED 289649.

Schlechty, Phillip C. and Betty Lou Whitford. "Types and Characteristics of School-University Collaboration." Kappan Delta Pi Record 24(3) (Spring 1988a): 81-83.

_____. "Shared Problems and Shared Vision: Organic Collaboration." In School-University Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases, and Concerns (1988b): 191-204.

Schon, D. A. Network-Related Intervention. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Education, 1977.

Schwab, Joseph. "The Practical 3: Translation into Curriculum." School Review 81 (1973): 501-22.

Shive, R. J. "School and University Partnerships: Meeting Common Needs." Improving College and University Teaching 32(3) (Summer 1984): 119-22.

Sinclair, Robert L. and Anne E. Harrison. "A Partnership for Increasing Student Learning: The Massachusetts Coalition for School Improvement." In School-University Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases, and Concerns (1988): 87-105.

Sirotnik, Kenneth A. and John I. Goodlad, eds. School-University Partnership in Action: Concepts, Cases, and Concerns. New York: Teachers College Press, 1988.

Sirotnik, Kenneth A. and John I. Goodlad. "Introduction." In School-University Partnership in Action: Concepts, Cases, and Concerns, vii-xii.

Sirotnik, Kenneth A. "The Meaning and Conduct of Inquiry in School-University Partnerships." In Kenneth A. Sirotnik and John I. Goodlad (eds.), School-University

Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases, and Concerns (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988): 169-90.

Sizer, Theodore R. Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1984.

_____. "Rebuilding: First Steps by the Coalition of Essential Schools," Phi Delta Kappan (September 1986): 38-42.

Soder, Roger. "Book Review: Partnerships for Improving Schools," Journal of Higher Education (November/December 1989): 729-31.

Stoloff, David L. The Social Context of Educational Partnerships: A Semantic Review. Paper presented at the AERA annual meeting, San Francisco, CA., 1989. ED 311563.

Su, Zhixin. Teacher Education Reform in the U. S. (1890-1986). Occasional Paper No. 3. Seattle, WA.: Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington, 1986.

_____. Exploring the Moral Socialization of Teachers. Technical Report No. 8. Seattle, WA.: Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington, 1989.

Task Force on Education for Economic Growth. Action for Excellence: A Comprehensive Plan to Improve Our Nation's Schools. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, 1983.

Thomas, Lewis. "On the Uncertainty of Science." Harvard Magazine (Sept/Oct. 1980): 19-22.

Trubowitz, S. When a College Works with a Public School: A Case Study of School-College Collaboration. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education, 1984.

_____. "Stages in the Development of School-College Collaboration." Educational Leadership (February 1986): 18-21.

Tyler, Ralph W. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1949.

U. S. Department of Education. "School, College, and University Partnerships Program; Notice Inviting Applications for New Awards for Fiscal Year 1990." Federal Register 55(70) (April 1990): 13714-13728.

Van de Water, Gordon B. The Governance of School-College Collaboratives: Lessons Learned from the College-Board's Educational Equality Project Models Program for School-

College Collaboration. New York: The College Board, 1989.

Vivian, James R. "Issues in Establishing and Developing an Educational Collaboration: The Yale-New Haven Experience." *Education and Urban Society* 19(1) (November 1986): 59-76.

Watkins, Beverly T. "Schools and Colleges Seen Failing to Form Close Partnerships." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 35(27) (March 15, 1989): A1, 15.

West Virginia University. *The Benedum Project*. Morgantown, WV.: Author, 1990.

Wilbur, Franklin P. "School-College Partnerships." *Journal of College Admissions* (Summer 1985): 20-28.

Wilbur, Franklin P., Leo M. Lambert and M. Jean Young. *National Directory of School-College Partnerships Current Models and Practices*. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1987.

______. *School-College Partnerships--A Look at the Major National Models.* Washington, D. C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1988.

Williams, David D. "The Brigham Young University-Public School Partnership." In Kenneth A. Sirotnik and John I. Goodlad (eds.), *School-University Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases and Concerns* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988): 124-47.

Wilson, Carol, Richard W. Clark, and Paul Heckman. *Breaking New Ground: Reflections on the School-University Partnerships in the National Network for Educational Renewal*. Occasional Paper No. 8. Seattle, WA.: Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington, 1989.